FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-200
Wednesday
18 October 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-200

CONTENTS

18 October 1989

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

General Denies Chemical Weapons Development *[TASS]* 1
'Perverted Logic' of U.S. Chemical Weapons Stance *[Golts in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Oct]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Representatives Cite Effects of Perestroyka *[TASS]* 3
Bank Council Holds Session in Varna 10-11 Oct *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 3
CEMA Power Industry Commission Meets 10-13 Oct *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 3
Comparison of Yakovlev Talk With Bloc Envoys *[PRAVDA 6 Oct]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

'Roundtable' Views Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Panama *[Moscow Radio]* 5
USSR-EEC Hold Talks on Economic Cooperation 9
    Round Two Ends *[TASS]* 9
    Agreement Possible *[IZVESTIYA 16 Oct]* 9
Woerner Speech on East-West Ties Criticized *[Zhukov in PRAVDA 14 Oct]* 10
Arab States Try To Block Israeli UN Membership *[TASS]* 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

First U.S. Business Exposition Opens in Moscow 12
    Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Attend Exhibition *[PRAVDA 18 Oct]* 12
    Gorbachev Tours Displays *[Moscow TV]* 12
U.S. Businessmen See 'Historic Opportunity' *[PRAVDA 17 Oct]* 14
Baker on 'Historic Opportunity' for Relations *[PRAVDA 18 Oct]* 14
    TASS Cites Baker on 'Opportunity' 15
Baker Notes Improvement of U.S.-USSR Relations *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Oct]* 15
U.S. Attorney General Thornburgh Pays Visit 16
    Sukharev-Thornburgh Meeting *[TASS]* 16
    More on Sukharev-Thornburgh Talks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Oct]* 16
    Kryuchkov Receives Thornburgh *[TASS]* 17
    PRAVDA Reports on Thornburgh Talks *[18 Oct]* 17
    Yakovlev, Thornburgh Hold Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 17
CIA Head Seeks 'Free Hand' in Operations Abroad *[TASS]* 18
    Webster Harks Back to Cold War *[Moscow TV]* 18
Planned Indianapolis-Riga Trial Flight Hits Snags *[IZVESTIYA 13 Oct]* 18

China

U.S. Video of PRC Prodemocracy Captives Shown *[Moscow TV]* 19
PRC's Ni Zhifu Ends USSR Visit *[TRUD 13 Oct]* 19
PRC Army Said Reorganizing, Trimming Forces *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 41]* 20

Northeast Asia

No Tae-u Proposals on 'Korean Community' Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Oct]* 21
Refusal To Compromise Mars Korean Unity Moves *[PRAVDA 16 Oct]* 22
12 Oct Session of Inter-Korea Talks Analyzed *[IZVESTIYA 15 Oct]* 22
Radio Urges Advertisement of ROK Products *[Moscow International]* 23

S. Korean Consumer Exhibition Opens in Moscow *[Moscow International]* 24
DPRK Army Minister Receives Admiral Sorokin *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Oct]* 24
Mongolian Foreign Minister Stops Over 6-7 Oct *[IZVESTIYA 9 Oct]* 24
Seen Off by CPSU's Girenko *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 24

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Philippines 'Polarization' Over Marcos Viewed *[Viktorov on Moscow International]* 24
Aquino Receives USSR Message of Condolences *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 25

Near East & South Asia

Syrian Chief of Staff Begins Visit 16 Oct 25
Meets Yazov, Moiseyev *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Oct]* 25
Tours Academy, Sees Akhromeyev *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Oct]* 25
Baker Plan, Negotiations With PLO Assessed *[Moscow International]* 25
Egypt's War Anniversary, Foreign Policy Noted *[Moscow TV]* 26
Iranian Consumer Goods Exhibition Opens in Baku *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 27
Nikitin Receives Mauritanian Fisheries Minister *[PRAVDA 14 Oct]* 27

Sub-Saharan Africa

Officials Tour Namibia, Preview Elections *[Moscow International]* 27
Johannesburg Talks on Namibia, Angola Viewed *[Patovskiy on Moscow International]* 28

East Europe

Gorbachev Interviewed in Berlin on GDR Ties *[Sofia POGLED No 42]* 28
SED's Hager Cited on 'Necessary Renovations' *[MOSCOW NEWS No 42]* 29
GDR Bodies Actively Seeking Dialogue With Public *[IZVESTIYA 18 Oct]* 30
Hungary Continues Debate on Future of MSZMP *[IZVESTIYA 18 Oct]* 31
Aboimov Consults With Hungary's Nemeth, Horn *[TASS]* 31
PRAVDA Profiles Hungarian Socialists' Nyers *[15 Oct]* 32
Polish Price Rises, Hungarian Front Forum Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Oct]* 32
Mazowiecki Discusses Economic Policy Guidelines *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 7 Oct]* 33
Mazowiecki's USSR Visit 'Still Being Discussed' *[Warsaw Radio]* 33
'Free Market Prices' Spur Polish Inflation *[TRUD 10 Oct]* 33
Soviet-Polish Friendship Society Secretaries Meet *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 34
Lushev Attends Fete for Polish Army Anniversary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Oct]* 35
PRAVDA Rounds Up Zaykov Visit to CSSR *[17 Oct]* 35
Zaykov Ends Visit, Departs *[TASS]* 36
Komi ASSR Chairman Received in Bulgaria *[TASS]* 36

West Europe

SPD's Brandt Winds Up Visit to Moscow 36
On Cooperation With Perestroyka *[TASS]* 36
More on News Conference *[Moscow TV]* 36
17 Oct Departure *[TASS]* 37
Admiral's Reticence on FRG Warship Visit Hit *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 37
Wallenberg Group Says Document 'Shed No New Light' *[TASS]* 38
Olivetti's Alleged Violation of COCOM Noted *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 38
October Soviet-French Meetings 'Unprecedented' *[TRUD 10 Oct]* 39
Delegation Head on Visit to Council of Europe *[IZVESTIYA 11 Oct]* 40
Soviet-Turkish Cooperation Meeting Opens *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 40

Latin America & Caribbean

Panamanian Emergency Laws Declared in Force *[TASS]* 41
Radio Moscow Role in Chilean Resistance Viewed *[Moscow International]* 41
'Special Anniversary Program' To Air *[Moscow International]* 42

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Deputy Alekseyev Discusses Constitutional Reform *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 7 Oct]* 43
Panels Discuss Local Elections 11 Oct *[PRAVDA 13 Oct]* 44
Panels Debate Language, Enterprise Laws 12 Oct *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Oct]* 45
More on Armenian Deputies' Supreme Soviet Walkout *[ARMENPRES]* 46
Commission Discusses Administrative Spending *[IZVESTIYA 16 Oct]* 47
Amendments to Cooperatives Law Debated 16 Oct *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 48
Moscow TV Shows 17 Oct Supreme Soviet Session 49
  1600 GMT 49
  1626 GMT 50
  1708 GMT 50
  1752 GMT 50
  1932 GMT 51
  2056 GMT 52
  Petrushenko on Draft Law 53
  Vorotnikov Remarks 53
  Denisov Speech 54
Ryzhkov Speech at 17 Oct Session *[Moscow Radio]* 55
TASS Summarizes 17 Oct Session 56
  'Heated Debate' on Property Law 57
Radio Correspondents Report Deputies' Remarks *[Moscow Radio]* 57
  Further on Discussion *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Decision Adopted on Cooperative Trading *[TASS]* 59
  Further on Vote *[Moscow Radio]* 59

Political & Social

Georgian Fuel Shortages Reach 'Crisis' Level *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 18 Oct]* 60
Railroad Difficulties Affect Rostov Enterprises *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Oct]* 60
Armenian Party Discusses Unloading of Trains *[Yerevan Radio]* 60
Government Accused of 'Exacerbating' NKAO Problem *[Yerevan International]* 61
ARMENPRESS Views Stepanakert Situation *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 27 Sep]* 61
Azerbaijan Draft Law on Sovereignty Outlined *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 17 Sep]* 62
Citizen Proposals Arrive at Tajik Party Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* 64
Tajik Language Law Adds Penalties *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 7 Oct]* 64
Tajik Court Convicts for Anti-Russian Slur *[KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 19 Aug]* 64
Philological Society Founded in Tajikistan *[Moscow International]* 65
Upcoming Elections in Kazakhstan Reported *[TASS]* 65
Drug Trafficking on Rise in Kazakhstan *[Moscow TV]* 66
Victimization of Uzbek Servicemen Disproved *[PRAVDA 17 Oct]* 66
Chimkent Officials' Trial Opens *[IZVESTIYA 12 Oct]* 67
Opinion Poll Criticizes Ukraine's Shevchenko *[Kiev International]* 68
Ukrainian Draft Election Law Scrutinized *[Moscow TV]* 68
Ukrainian Party Chief Ivashko on Mass Media *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 12 Oct]* 68
Soviet Deputy Discusses Polish-Ukrainian Relations *[Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA 27 Sep]* 69
Belorussian Official on Public's Letters *[TASS]* 70
MVD Troop Commander Shatalin Profiled *[MOSCOW NEWS No 40]* 70
Vilnius Militia Refuses To Aid Army Officer *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Oct]* 72
Lithuanian Party's Brazauskas Interviewed *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 14 Oct]* 72
Procurator Warns Yedinstvo Movement Leader *[Vilnius International]* 74
Vilnius People's Court Workers Go on Strike *[Vilnius International]* 74
Lithuanian-Polish Relationship Viewed *[LITERATURA IR MENAS No 21]* 74
Reportage on Latvian People's Front Congress *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Oct]* 75
Latvian People's Front on Citizens' Committees *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 24 Aug]* 77

- Riga Conference Discusses Liberation of Baltic *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Oct]* 78
- Latvia's Gorbunov Analyzes Range of Issues *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 12 Sep]* 78
- Estonian People's Front Chairman Interviewed *[Tallinn Radio]* 85
- Balts Accused of Endangering Perestroyka *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 40]* 86
- Soviet Leaders Receive Orthodox Church Leaders 88
  - Shevardnadze *[Moscow TV]* 88
  - Lukyanov *[Moscow International]* 89
  - Further on Lukyanov Meeting *[TASS]* 89
- Dashichev: Old System 'Doomed To Die' *[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 16 Oct]* 89
- Academician Calls for Sweeping Economic Reform *[Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA 13 Oct]* 90
- Culture, Education Official Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 10 Oct]* 91
- People's Front's Kagarlitskiy Grants Interview *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 15-16 Oct]* 92
- Deputy Sobchak Views Interregional Group Future 94
- Baklanov Explains Scientific Production *[Moscow TV]* 94
  - Discusses Electronics Industry Problems *[TASS]* 95
  - On Defense Enterprise Conversion *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Sep]* 95
- Aping of West, 'Russophobia' Deplored *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Oct]* 95
- Economist Repudiates 'Brezhnev Doctrine' *[Sheynis in IZVESTIYA 14 Oct]* 97
  - Ponomarev Denies Brezhnev Doctrine Existed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Oct]* 100
- Crime Continues To Rise, But at Slower Pace *[IZVESTIYA 11 Oct]* 102
- Briefing Held on Crimes Against Foreigners *[IZVESTIYA 4 Oct]* 102
- Council of Ministers Examines Pensions Bill *[Moscow TV]* 103
- Economic Integration in Sverdlovsk, Donetsk *[Moscow Radio]* 103
- Government Panel Views Defense Industry Conversion *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 104
- Dialogue Between Party, Informals Urged *[PRAVDA 8 Oct]* 105
- New 'Peace Association' Group Formed *[TASS]* 107
- Contents of KOMMUNIST Issue No 15 Reviewed *[PRAVDA 14 Oct]* 107
- New Weekly To Feature Interethnic Relations *[Moscow International]* 108
- Central Auditing Commission Session Held 21 Sep *[PRAVDA 22 Sep]* 108

Economic

- Merits of Leasing Situation Discussed 109
  - Ivashko Interviewed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 21 Sep]* 109
  - Readers Offer Opinions *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 27 Sep]* 112
- Goods Shortages, High Prices Discussed *[PRAVDA 14 Oct]* 114
- Power Outages Call Quality Control Into Question *[IZVESTIYA 13 Oct]* 115

Scientific

- 'Cosmos-2048' Satellite Launched 17 Oct *[TASS]* 116
- 'Mir' Cosmonauts Finish 6th Week of Experiments 117
  - Carry Out Maintenance *[Moscow Radio]* 117
  - Continue Research *[TASS]* 117
- Microcircuit Failure Delays Module's Launch *[IZVESTIYA 13 Oct]* 117
- Weightlessness Studied on Biological Satellite *[TASS]* 118

Military

- Details of Kirovabad Airport Runway Collision *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Oct]* 118
- New Combat Training Policy Explained *[Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA 13 Oct]* 119
- Nuclear Detonation in 1954 Troop Excercise Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Sep]* 120

General Denies Chemical Weapons Development

LD1710110689 Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—"Claims that the Soviet Union is developing the most up-to-date types of chemical weapons are absolutely false", Major-General Igor Yevstafiyev, chief of the Chemical Troops Department of the USSR Defence Ministry, told TASS.

The general said that reports in the western press on a "Soviet chemical menace" are usually timed, as a rule, to coincide with Soviet steps to achieve a ban on chemical weapons. Usually they aim to cast doubt on the sincerity of Soviet intentions. They speculate on our openness in this question.

"The latest case," Yevstafiyev noted, "is the interview of Ghent University Professor Hendricks with a FRANCE-PRESSE correspondent. He claimed that Angolan government troops and their Cuban allies had allegedly used new Soviet weapons against UNITA. The professor said that it combines incendiary and intoxicating qualities. [no closing quotation mark as received]

But after careful investigation and meetings with experts, Hendricks was compelled to withdraw his accusations. 'My arguments concerning the use of chemical weapons in Angola were absolutely groundless,' he said.

"Who needs these anti-Soviet allegations? Only those who wish to slow down the process of chemical disarmament," the General pointed out.

Yevstafiyev said that preparations for mass production of different types of binary armaments were in full swing in the United States. The U.S. Congress has allocated almost 2.8 billion dollars on chemical weapons. "This is precisely why everything is done to divert public attention from the true advocates of chemical weapons," General Yevstafiyev concluded.

'Perverted Logic' of U.S. Chemical Weapons Stance

PM1710144989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Oct 89 First Edition p3

[A. Golts "Military-Political Commentary": "Ban Them But... Produce Them Anyway"]

[Text] THE WASHINGTON POST has published a report which seems to be something of a sensation. "The United States," the newspaper wrote, "intends to continue to produce chemical weapons even after the new universal treaty on the destruction of these weapons comes into force." This decision, THE WASHINGTON POST goes on to point out, was made by President Bush after he had studied a "top secret" analysis of policy in this sphere.

If this is indeed the situation (and THE WASHINGTON POST is hardly likely to indulge in sheer conjecture regarding U.S. policy), it signifies a change in the United States' approach to the problem of eliminating chemical-weapons. Primarily because this approach is directly in conflict with the stand taken by the states involved in drawing up a convention to ban these barbaric weapons and completely eliminate all stockpiles. It was assumed that the production of chemical weapons would cease immediately after the convention had come into force.

Meanwhile, the recently signed Soviet-U.S. statement expresses the sides' commitment—without any provisos—to the idea of a total ban on the "silent death." But the statement goes further than this one declaration. A specific accord, which would help to remove still existing fears regarding verification, is also discussed. In fact, an understanding has been reached to conduct a joint experiment, during which the sides will exchange data on the military-chemical potentials of the Soviet Union and the United States, to be followed by on-site inspections to verify the accuracy of the information conveyed to one another.

But is the value of activity designed to remove obstacles in the way of a convention not lost if, at the same time, the United States is creating new difficulties in this direction that are even more serious? After all, a spokesman for the administration told the newspaper that the United States intends to propose a review of the text of the draft convention in the near future. Simply in order to retain the right to produce toxic chemical agents.

Surely this is absurd—to ban chemical weapons in order to produce them? Of course it is absurd. But only from the viewpoint of those who seriously want to rid the planet of chemical weapons. The actions of certain U.S. circles have their own logic. It is determined by the existence of a new generation of chemical weapons—binary weapons. Let me remind you that binary ammunition incorporates two comparatively low-toxicity components which turn into lethal chemical agents only at the point when they are used in combat. This, American strategists believe, will facilitate the storage of toxic chemical agents and consequently broaden the possible range of their use.

This perverted logic required binary ammunition to be put into mass production when the Geneva talks were gathering momentum. Advocates of binary weapons claimed at the time that the production of new chemical agents would force the Soviets to conduct the talks in a constructive manner. Now, however, when we are literally a few steps away from concluding the convention, the very existence of binary technology is holding up the work of the conference. Despite this, representatives of the U.S. military department are urging the president to continue the production of binary ammunition. Even if the convention is concluded, according to THE WASHINGTON POST. They explain this by saying that if, inthe future, the United States should wish to back out of the agreement, it will have a "modernized chemical arsenal" in readiness.

But this emasculates the whole sense of the future convention. In this respect it is impossible to disagree with M. Meselson, the famous expert on chemical weapons, who is of the opinion that the administration is "jeopardizing the whole treaty for the sake of saving its binary program."

It cannot be denied that we are facing a dangerous recurrence of that old illness when the existence of a militarist project and the illusory military advantages which its implementation is supposed to bring are jeopardizing the security of many countries.

CEMA Representatives Cite Effects of Perestroyka

LD1210221789 Moscow TASS in English 2131 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 13 TASS—The effect of perestroika processes in countries of the socialist community on the activity of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance which will celebrate its 40th anniversary this year was analysed at a news conference held at the United Nations headquarters.

The news conference was given by Kurt Borch of the GDR, CMEA deputy secretary, and Boris Koltsov of the USSR, chief of the CMEA Department for External Relations, who take part in the 44th session of the UN General Assembly.

Answering questions from reporters, Kurt Borch noted that vast strategic prospects open to CMEA in present conditions. The course at radical renewal of the mechanism of economic interaction in the CMEA framework was adopted in 1984 on the basis of the arrangement of nine countries to study and create conditions for a gradual shaping of a joint market.

This is not a crisis, but a natural process of renewing conditions for cooperation and the functioning of the entire mechanism of economic interaction within CMEA in the epoch of the acceleration of scientific and technological progress, Borch said.

It was noted at the news conference that the main purpose of the restructuring of CMEA is to perfect coordination of national economic plans. In the next five-year period (1991-1995) CMEA bodies of planning will be deciding only strategic matters, such as the supply of raw materials and energy sources.

All the fundamental questions of specialisation and cooperation within the separate industries will be decided by enterprises, which will enable them to participate directly in the process of economic integration.

Bank Council Holds Session in Varna 10-11 Oct

PM1310130989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Session of International Bank for Economic Cooperation Council"]

[Text] Sofia, 11 Oct—The 71st session of the International Bank for Economic Cooperation [IBEC] Council was held 10-11 October 1989 in Varna.

Delegations from the bank council member countries—Bulgaria, Hungary, the SRV, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and the CSSR—took part in the session's work along with representatives of the CEMA Secretariat and the International Investment Bank. S. Potac, head of the CSSR delegation at the bank council and chairman of the CSSR State Bank Board, presided at the session.

The bank council examined progress in fulfilling the program of measures to improve IBEC activity on the basis of the decisions of the 43d (extraordinary) sitting of the CEMA session on further enhancing the effectiveness of the transfer ruble credit-transfer mechanism in and approved the bank's work.

The IBEC Council detailed the bank's credit plan for this year, approved the plan for the council's work in 1990 and 1991, and discussed and adopted decisions on other questions relating to the bank's activity.

The council session took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and businesslike cooperation.

CEMA Power Industry Commission Meets 10-13 Oct

PM1710115389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Power Problems Discussed"]

[Text] Sofia, 14 Oct—The third sitting of the CEMA Standing Commission on cooperation in the field of electrical and nuclear power was held in Sofia 10 through 13 October. Taking part were delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and the CSSR. An SFRY delegation also took part in the sitting.

The sitting examined the progress in implementing the CEMA Executive Committee resolutions relating to the commission's activity and proposals on new subjects and existing problems of the third priority avenue of the comprehensive program for the scientific and technical progress of the CEMA countries through the year 2000. There was an analysis of the course of the fulfillment of the program for constructing nuclear electric power stations and nuclear thermal power stations in the CEMA countries through the year 2000 and there was a discussion of measures aimed at the program's further implementation. The heads of the delegations exchanged opinions on questions of the modernization and safe operation of first-generation nuclear electric power stations with water-cooled power reactor-440 reactors.

Those taking part in the session discussed questions of the development and improvement of the parallel work of the CEMA countries' unified electricity grids and of cooperation between the CEMA European countries and the SRV, Cuba, and Mongolia in the field of electrical power. There was an examination of the plan for work for the forthcoming 2-year period.

Comparison of Yakovlev Talk With Bloc Envoys

PM0610195989

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 6 October 1989 carries in its Second Edition on page 5 a report on A.N.

Yakovlev's meeting with heads of the socialist diplomatic corps in Moscow. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, entitled "Meeting at the CPSU Central Committee," with the Moscow TASS English version, which was published on page 4 of the 6 October Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, reveals the following variations:

Page four, column one, first paragragh in PRAVDA begins: ...[Text] On 5 October Aleksandr Yakovlev, member... (supplying date);

Page four, column two, last paragraph, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...and answered questions. The meeting was attended by SRV Ambassador Nguyen Manh Cam, Ambassador of the Socialist Republic of Romania I. Bucur, Charges d'Affaires ad interim F. Spasov of the Bulgarian People's Republic, J. Barabas of the Hungarian People's Republic, K.-H. Fehlberg of the GDR, Leng Peng Long of the State of Cambodia, Koth Sidlakone of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and P. Kubasek of the CSSR; and Counselor-Envoys Kim Hi Su of the DPRK, R. Mirabal of the Republic of Cuba, Zh. Ensaykhan [name as transliterated] of the Mongolian People's Republic, and J. Smolinski of the Polish People's Republic.... (supplying additional paragraph).

'Roundtable' Views Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Panama

LD1510190189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 15 Oct 89

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Gennadiy Vedenyapin, host, and Nikolay Agayants and Boris Andrianov, foreign policy commentators]

[Text] [Vedenyapin] Hello, comrades, and welcome to our regular Roundtable discussion. Your host today is Gennadiy Vedenyapin, and beside me I have my colleagues, foreign policy commentators Nikolay Agayants and Boris Andrianov.

This week, as you know, was the end of the general political debate at the 44th session of the UN General Assembly. The discussion lasted almost 3 weeks, with speeches by no fewer than 150 speakers, including... [changes thought] there presidents, prime ministers, and foreign ministers from many countries there. They set forth governments' point of view on today's major problems. Among those problems were the easing of tension in the world, arms reductions, disarmament, the reinforcement of international security, the elimination of regional conflicts, the acceleration of socioeconomic development, and the fight against terrorism and the spread of drugs; too many, I think, to list here. The debate showed that the ideas the Soviet Union took with it to the session are in tune with the feelings of the world community. The USSR spoke in favor of stimulating stable and, at the same time, dynamic progress toward a restructuring of international relations, with the most active involvement of the United Nations. The delegates' speeches that an overwhelming majority of the community of nations is ready to exert efforts to augment the United Nation's peacemaking potential, to reinforce the organization's turn toward practical action, to enhance its efficiency, and to ensure the primary of international law.

[Agayants] In connection with this, Gennadiy Aleksandrovich, one cannot pass over the statement made by U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney. He said that the cut by Congress in the appropriation requested by the administration for the Stratgegic Defense Initiative program threatens to wreck its implementation, and that he intends to advise the President to veto the bill if the resources allocated by it prove to be insufficient to carry out the program. It seems to me that statements like this are designed, first and foremost, to reassure conservative Republican circles who are alarmed by the success of the Wyoming talks. the Pentagon chief is also sending a signal to the military-industrial complex as a whole by demonstrating the present administration's commitment to a program for the creation of ABM systems making use of outer space. It would seek that some people in the United States are all too frightened by the Soviet side's stated willingness to sign and ratify a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms, even if by the time it has been drafted no accord has been reached on the problem of antimissile defense and space weapons.

[Andrianov] In this connection, I would say it's reasonable to ask why, indeed, one should spend huge sums of money developing SDI when there is already a clearly visible possibility of a mutual reduction, a very substantial one, in Soviet and American strategic nuclear missile arsenals. What's more, the American people's belief in Reagan's naive and quite unfounded dream of completely protecting the United States by a space umbrella has long since evaporated, particularly since the Bush administration, with its realistic assessment of the scientific and technical difficulties, is no longer maintaining that the Strategic Defense Initiative will provide hope for creating an absolutely reliable shield against a missile attack.

[Vedenyapin] Incidentally, it's now hardly possible to convince the U.S. public of the very possibility of an attack, because the enemy image associated with our country has faded in the minds of the Americans. Public opinion polls in the United States indicate that taxpayers clearly prefer mutual reductions in Soviet and U.S. weapons arsenals to Star Wars.

[Agayants] There's one more thing I'd like to mention: The U.S. Administration often states that the SDI can be used as a means of putting pressure on the Russians—on us, that is—in the arms control sphere. Yet this trump can now no longer be played either. One ought to confess that when Reagan announced the Strategic Defense Initiative we, too, at first, fell for the star warriors' publicity stunts and overestimated the capabilities of a future ABM system. Now this, too, is in the past. The USSR has a clear idea of the program's potential and of the threats it poses. We also, by the way, have an idea of how to neutralize its impact on strategic parity at considerably less cost.

[Andrianov] I think this point could be, and even must be, spelled out in more detail. Because the Soviet Union is now not objecting to the United States carrying out research, work in the SDI framwork, allowing the conducting of research and associated tests not only in laboratories, but even in space. But this must not have anything to do with components, anti-missile defense systems and prototypes of them based in space. This is why the Soviet Union is insisting that the treaty on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive arms must state that the sides are bound to adhere to the ABM Treaty and contain a provision on the right to renounce the strategic offensive arms treaty if one of the sides fails to adhere to the ABM Treaty.

[Vedenyapin] Fine, but what does the United States stand to gain from the accelerated continuation of the work on the SDI program, for which the Pentagon chief is campaigining so hard? If an SDI system is created, the United States will have acquired a hypothetical defensive system against just such a hypothetical threat, but at the same time the danger will arise of the Soviet Union's renunciation of the future treaty on strategic offensive arms. So the question arises of whether Mr. Cheney wants a strategic offensive arms treaty, or would he, after all, prefer to create SDI as soon as possible and to build up nuclear arsenals?

[Agayants] As we can see, the question has yet to be answered. But I think we should move on to another subject, Gennadiy Aleksandrovich. Today is 15 October, a date which reminds us that precisely 8 months ago the last Soviet combat vehicle with its crew left Afghanistan, and I think this gives us occasion to talk about events in Afghanistan and about what is now going on around the republic.

[Andrianov] The several years of war in Afghanistan and its agonizing consequences have irrefutably proven that bloodshed has not, nor could, solve any problems at all. I'd like to quote here a Ghanaian journalist who recently spent some time in Afghanistan with a group of his colleagues. His name is Lloyd Evans and he's a correspondent for the Ghanaian newspaper PEOPLE'S DAILY GRAPHIC. He writes that the use of weapons merely complicates the situation; in the most difficult circumstances, he recalls, the leadership of the Afghan revolution has proclaimed a policy of national reconciliation and taken concrete measures to put it into effect. It's a policy that is inseparable from the noble and humanistic aims of the April Revolution: To guarantee peace and prosperity for the people. Starting in 1982, talks were held in Geneva between Afghanistan and Pakistan with the participation both of the Soviet Union and the United States, acting as guarantors. The accords achieved at those talks included the cessation of interference in the domestic affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan—now called the Republic of Afghanistan, as you know—and also international guarantees of the non-resumption of that interference, the voluntary return of Afghan refugees and the withdrawal of Soviet troops. In accordance with the document signed last year, Soviet soldiers have left Afghanistan and the United Nations has organized a monitoring mission to observe the fulfilment of the Geneva Agreement.

[Vedenyapin] It's an interesting article, you know, and I'd like to continue with what Evans goes on to say. What are we seeing in Afghanistan now? Crude violations of the accords by Pakistan-based rebels with the active support of the United States—well, there's nothing unusual about that anymore; thousands of Pakistani soldiers and Saudi mercenaries, together with Afghan opposition groups, are attacking the country's towns every day. In July alone, for instance, when hundreds of missiles and shells were fired against Kabul, 264 people were killed and around 1,000 were injured, including children.

[Agayants] Coming back to what you were saying, Boris Vasiliyevich, I would like to focus the questions that are arising. What are the United States and Pakistan trying to achieve by dragging out the conflict in the region? Should the international community sit by and merely observe their cruel actions, while adopting general nebulous statements condemning genocide in the region? What should be done to stop regional conflicts from spreading? In order to develop, concludes Evans, the world requires security and cooperation; all of us must do our bit to seek solutions to regional conflicts.

[Andrianov] I'd like to mention the kinds of tricks the U.S. side pulls sometimes. A U.S. newspaper, THE NEW YORK TIMES, has just come out with yet another sensation, if I may use the word. referring to information contained in a certain report on Afghanistan put together by U.S. intelligence services, it claims that there are Soviet servicemen in that country. These servicemen are allegedly not merely performing the functions of military advisers, but are dressed in Afghan army uniforms and carrying out missile attacks against the rebels' positions. So what is one to say about such a report? One thing only. All this, from the beginning to end, is a brazen fabrication. After all, it is not the first time that Washington has circulated conjectures like this. About a month ago, around the beginning of September, similar fabrications were contained in a statement by Peter Tomsen, the U.S. President's special envoy to the so-called provisional government of the Afghan opposition in Peshawar. It is not for nothing that they say that lies do not go far. This fabrication did not last long. It was immediately refuted by our country's Foreign Ministry spokesman in a speech in Moscow. He stated that in Afghanistan there were no Soviet military advisers whatsoever. As for the Soviet Embassy in Kabul, yes, there is indeed a military attache apparatus there, but nothing more than this.

So, why indeed is this falsification being circulated? Quite obviously this is to try and justify the continuation of gross interference in Afghan affairs by Pakistan and the United States.

[Vedenyapin] Now there are reports about the fact that combined detachments of the Afghan armed opposition are preparing, with the direct assistance of Pakistan and the United States; a broad-scale offensive on the administrative center of Nangarhar Province; the town of Jalalabad. This was reported at a briefing held for foreign journalists by Lieutenant-General 'Abdul Haq Ulumi, secretary of the Supreme Council for the Defense of the Homeland. The offensive is planned for the period of 16-18 October. Ulumi claimed that according to urgent reports, a meeting was held in Pakistan, in which those taking part were ringleaders of the insurgents—Rabbani, Khaleis, Hikmatyar, Sayyaf—and high ranking Pakistani officers. The meeting was conducted by Robert Oakley, U.S. ambassador in Pakistan, and Peter Tomsen the U.S. President's special envoy to the armed Afghan opposition. We have already mentioned his name. They developed a plan for a blitz attack. Ten to fifteen thousand people will take part in it. Sixty american military advisers are heading the organization of this blitzkrieg, let us put it this way. It is planned that supporting fire will be provided by missile subunits of the 54th Pakistani Army. The facts given are quite specific: 2 and ½ kilometers from Torkhan on Pakistani territory, are concentrated 11 launchers of heavy rocket-propelled shells, 60,000 missiles, and 4,300 Pakistani military servicemen. In a conversation with a TASS correspondent, Ulumi noted that a concentration of major insurgent gangs totalling 6,300 people have been registered in the valleys of the rivers Kabul and Konar. So far the extremists are not showing any signs of any special activity. A general monitoring of the operation, as they say, will be implemented directly by Oakley and Tomsen.

The general stressed that the Armed Forces of the Afghan Republic are ready to give a fitting rebuff to the fresh adventure by Pakistan, the United States and the Afghan extremists. The Jalalabad garrison, he said, has accumulated quite a lot of experience in combat operations defending the city after a successful offensive on the positions of the insurgents who beseiged an administrative center during 5 months. The defense zones have been considerably enlarged: They are about 50-60 km from the center of Jalalabad. Ulumi reported that the defenders of the city are supplied with everything necessary to rebuff the planned offensive.

According to reports, about 300 internal armed clashes, this is quite a lot, have been registered across the Afghan territory over the past 2 and ½ months. Four thousand people were killed and nearly 2,000 extremists were injured. In the situation near Khowst, Jalalabad, and Herat, no changes have yet taken place. As a result of actions by the Afghan Army sub-units, over 100 Afghan opposition fighters have been killed.

[Agayants] I think one ought to stress once again that the USSR has never put forward, and is not putting forward, any demands relating to the Afghan settlement. Pakistani President Ghulam Ishaq Khan made a statement in his speech to Pakistani border guards in Peshawar last Monday. His speech noted that the USSR must stop supporting the Republic of Afghanistan and, in the opinion of the head of the Pakistani state, if the USSR demands that the Government of the Republic of the Afghanistan is included in the structure of a future coalition power, this, allegedly, will be a serious obstacle for resolving the conflict in that country. The Soviet position is clear and is clearly designated. At its base is the idea that the problem of Afghanistan must be tackled solely by Afghans themselves. Proceeding from this, the USSR called and is calling for a halt to any interference in the internal affairs of the republic and for assistance to be given for the beginning of an inter-Afghan political dialogue, with the aim of setting up a coalition government on the broadest basis. Participation in this government by the lawful authorities in Kabul derives from all the realities existing in Afghanistan and from the actual influence and prestige that the authorities enjoy among Afghans. It is impossible to attain peace and national agreement in Afghanistan while ignoring a force that is influential both political and militarily, like the lawful government of the republic of Afghanistan. Any attempts, whatever the source, to demand that this government resign unconditionally cannot be considered as anything other than a desire to continue interfering in the affairs of the sovereign Afghan state and dictating to Afghans how they should build their future.

[Andrianov] A conference dedicated to the Muslim festivities celebrating the birthday of the prophet Muhammad was held in the Afghan capital last week. Those taking part were political, public, and religious officials of Afghanistan, of course, as well as guests from a number of countries.

At the opening ceremony of the conference, a message from Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan, was read. The head of the the Afghan state pointed out, inter alia, that in the past year important political changes took place in Afghanistan. Since the withdrawal of Soviet troops was completed, the country's leadership has put forward flexible and far reaching initiatives to stop the inter-Afghan conflict, which are however, still being rejected by the irreconcilable opposition. At the same time, contacts are being arranged with other circles of the opposition including a number of field commanders, who, having realized the hopelessness of banking on the pressure of force, are ceasing their combat actions against government troops in the areas they control.

Extremist-minded formations of the insurgents are not only continuing to wage the war against their own people, but are also broadening its scale with outside help. Over the last 12 months 3,134 people, including old men, women, and children have become victims to barbaric shellings in population centers. Seven thousand and three hundred Afghans have been crippled. The insurgents have damaged 50 mosques. They are trying to pass themselves off as fighters.

[Vedenyapin] In examining the situation in Cental America on one of our recent programs, we came to the conclusion that despite the understanding in Tela, reached within the framework of the Guatamala process, the position remains tense and explosive as a result of Washington's attempts to destabilize the situation and retain its military presence there. The United States continues to give assistance to the Contras, opposing in every way the implementation of plans for their disarmament and repatriation. It gives moral and financial support to the opposition forces in Nicaragua, hoping by hook or by crook to bring about the removal of the Sandinistas from power in the republic.

[Agayants] I would add, Gennadiy Aleksandorvich, that in seeking to implement his goals, Uncle Sam doesn't stand on ceremony much where the standards of conventional human morality or the standards of international law are concerned, as he interferes openly in the internal affairs of a sovereign state. This is giving rise to serious concern and displeasure among American legislators. I have in mind the Bush administration's desire to put a bill through the U.S. Congress allocating $9 million for indirect financing of the opposition's election campaign in Nicaragua. This intention to exert an influence upon the outcome of the voting will most likely meet with the same fate that befell the failed attempts to remove that country's present government with the help of the Contras. That was a statement by Senator Brock Adams. I do not think that we should interfere in Nicaragua, either with the help of bullets or with the help of voting papers, he added.

[Andrianov] I think it is worth recalling that the request by the master of the White House for financial resources to be allocated for political activity in Nicaragua was put forward for examination by the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress at the beginning of this month. Under the administration's plan, $5 million should reach Nicaragua via the so-called National Endowment for Democracy.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, it's the one which was set up by Congress way back in 1982 with the objective of ensuring that democratic elections are held in different countries of the world.

[Andrianov] Absolutely correct. In effect, this is the notorious fund which has been used and which is being used by the U.S. Government for interference in the internal affairs of other states, as is now taking place specifically with regard to Nicaragua.

[Vedenyapin] How is it intended to spend the other 4 million?

[Andrianov] It's a kind of knight's move, so to speak. The money will pass under an article governing the provision of non party, technical assistance to the opposition in the holding of the elections.

[Agayants] Incidentally, the U.S. House of Representatives approved the bill containing the administration's proposal by 263 votes to 156 after sharp discussion. I think that no matter what debates flare up, when this issue is examined in its full composition in the Senate the President's request for 9 million will be supported there as well.

[Vedenyapin] In the meantime, according to reports carried by overseas mass media and, in particular, a correspondent of the Spanish EFE agency, bands of Contras are entering Nicaragua from the territory of neighboring Honduras and their objective remains unchanged—to terrorize the local population and force it to vote for the candidates from the block of right-wing parties, the opposition alliance.

[Agayants] In addition, the Contras are planning to hamper the normal progress of voter registration, which will continue for the next 2 Sundays. In other words, literally all means are being put into operation.

[Vedenyapin] The situation is an alarming one. However, there are still 4 months before the elections in Nicaragua, which as we know will take place in February of next year, and one would like to hope that the Sandinista government and all progressive forces in the republic will manage to unite their efforts and come out resolutely against the die-hard Somoza-ites and reactionaries.

[Andrianov] On condition, of course, that the process of a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Central America will continue and gather momentum.

[Vedenyapin] Of course. There are still a lot of submerged reefs along this course and all kinds of obstacles put there by Washington. Take, say, the recent dramatic events in Panama. Highly placed officials like Baker, the U.S. secretary of state, and Scowcroft, assistant to the President on national security affairs, have admitted U.S. involvement in the attempted coup in Panama.

[Agayants] The mutiny was prepared by a group of Panamanian officers. After their action, a statement was issued about the removal from his post of general Manuel Antonio Noriega, commander-in-chief of the National Defense Forces. But those behind the putsch clearly miscalculated. Fierce cross fire which broke out in the center of the capital and lasted for about 5 hours ended with the arrest of the conspirators. Their troops were forced to lay down their arms. Two of the leaders of the failed coup found refuge on the territory of the U.S. military base at Fort Clayton in the Canal zone.

[Andrianov] Sensational information about the role of the United States in the events in Panama has been published by THE WASHINGTON POST. Its journalists, Bob Woodward and Joe Pichirallo, learned that when the mutiny was at its height, U.S. Armed Forces in Panama belonging to the southern command were given the order to seize Noriega and remove him from the republic. The operation was to have been carried out by U.S. servicemen clad in uniforms of the Panamanian Army. General Thurnan, Commander of the U.S. troops in Panama, was also instructed to draw up a plan for direct military operations against the Panamanian National Defense Forces. In that event, however, he had to be given additional sanction from President Bush.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, everything was worked out according to the book, in the best traditions of the big stick policy. The operation, however, did not take place, because by the time the order was received the mutiny had failed.

[Agayants] It has to be said that this unseemly story is now being whipped up widely by many of the mass information media, particularly in Latin America, for it is evidence of the fact that Washington has absolutely no intention of giving up gunboat diplomacy and imperial pretensions with regard to governments and regimes that are not to its liking. We are all perfectly aware of the U.S. attitude to General Noriega, Panama's strong man, and the present Panamanian authorities. Furthermore in an NBC television interview James Baker, U.S. secretary of state, stated directly, and I quote: The official position of the United States amounts to this, that General Noriega has to go. We are prepared to use all resources at our disposal in order to achieve this aim. What are these resources then? Without batting an eye, Baker said that such resources include diplomatic pressure, economic sanctions, and also the use of force. A surprising position, isn't it?

[Andrianov] One can only be amazed at the ease and the cynicism with which decisions are made in Washington today that are linked with the fates of the leaders of sovereign states, without the slightest concern about whether or not decisions of that kind accord with the principles and standards of international law.

[Vedenyapin] Commenting on the U.S. interference in Panama and Washington's involvement in the failed mutiny, many overseas newspapers view these events as a serious blow against the prestige of the United States. The failed coup attempt has been the first big humiliation of the Bush administration. That is why the London THE SUNDAY TIMES writes. The humiliation is so great that many people in the U.S. capital consider that the Bush government will try to organize another coup in Panama, and as soon as possible; that is how the OBSERVER picks up the theme. We'll leave that to the conscience of the OBSERVER.

[Agayants] The situation in Panama continues to remain extremely complex. As a result of the unending aggression against Panama by the United States and the trade and economic blockade declared by Washington, the republic's leadership was obliged to adopt a number of extraordinary measures to bring the country out of a crisis situation as quickly as possible. A curfew was introduced in the capital on 3 October. This will be in force until the situation has completely stabilized.

[Vedenyapin] Well the time available for our program has come to an end. Those taking part in it were Nikolay Agayants, Boris Andrianov, and Gennadiy Vedenyapin. We thank you all for your attention. All the best to you!

USSR-EEC Hold Talks on Economic Cooperation

Round Two Ends

LD1110103589 Moscow TASS in English 2220 GMT 10 Oct 89

[Text] Brussels October 11 TASS—The second round of talks on the conclusion of an agreement on trade and economic cooperation between the European Communities and the Soviet Union concluded on Tuesday in the headquarters of the European Communities.

The Soviet delegation headed by deputy chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission Ivan Ivanov and the E.C. delegation headed by E.C. Deputy Director Geanluigi Giola began detailed examination of the draft agreement, the most extensive one among all the agreements signed with the European Communities so far.

The parties reached agreement in principle on granting each other the most favoured treatment in trade and adjusting cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Common Market in such fields as power engineering, investments, science and technology, transport, environmental protection and some others.

The third round of talks is scheduled for the end of this year.

Agreement Possible

PM1710111189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Oct 89 Morning Edition p3

[Own correspondent B. Moskvichev dispatch: "The Finish at the End of the Year?"]

[Text] Brussels—The EEC and the USSR are moving successfully toward concluding an agreement on trade and economic cooperation, a spokesman for the European Communities Commission has said.

He stressed that this assessment of progress made in the talks is not some diplomatic formula but evidence of the real progress made during the second round of the talks in Brussels. He voiced the hope that an agreement could be signed by the end of this year.

For his part, the head of the Soviet delegation said during a conversation with journalists that, while sharing the optimism of his partners with regard to the date when an agreement could be concluded, he would not like this to affect the quality and value of the agreement. The Soviet side believes that there are still some questions unresolved, which the participants in the talks have still to work on. According to him, more successful progress is being prevented by the fact that the EEC is still failing to take into account the changes being made in the Soviet economy in the course of reform, which are designed to give greater independence and freedom to various enterprises and firms and the right to enter the foreign market.

Answering questions from a correspondent from the British REUTERS agency regarding the Soviet Union's interest in securing loans from the EEC through the European Investment Bank, the Soviet spokesman said that the Soviet Union has no intention of overstepping the danger line of reasonable debt.

The future agreement between the EEC and the USSR, concluded for a 10-year period, is basically analogous to agreements signed between the "Common Market" and Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

In the opinion of the community's economic experts, the main aims of the future agreement are, first and foremost, to create most favored nation status for Soviet exports to "Common Market" countries, and also to ensure that the Soviet side provides all the necessary conditions for the activity of Western businesses in the Soviet Union.

For the first time in the practice of EEC relations with socialist countries, cooperation is envisaged in the sphere of scientific and technical research and in safety guarantees in the nuclear power sphere.

The next, third round of talks will take place at the end of October this year.

Woerner Speech on East-West Ties Criticized

PM1610114689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[Yuriy Zhukov article under the rubric "Political Observer's Notes": "What Worries Mr Woerner"—passages between slantlines are printed in boldface]

[Text] I do not think I am mistaken in saying that the course and outcome of the highly unusual North Atlantic Assembly session that ended in Rome last Tuesday caused dissatisfaction not only among the majority of its participants, but also among millions of people who were following its progress.

This consultative organ, which unites parliamentarians from the 16 NATO member states, has met 35 times, and has always talked about the "Soviet threat" and about stepping up the arms race. All at once, an unexpected development: At this session of the assembly, Soviet General V.N. Lobov, chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, was taking part as a guest, and a dialogue began there on East-West relations. As our Rome correspondent rightly noted in PRAVDA, the political climate is changing for the better.

"The new atmosphere prevailing in East-West relations is causing legitimate satisfaction," Senator Mariano Rumor, deputy chairman of the North Atlantic Assembly and head of the Italian delegation, said on the closing of the session. "Constructiveness in dialogue," he said, "promotes the attainment of lasting detente."

But for all that, another trend emerged clearly in the course of the debates: The forces that have dominated NATO since long ago are very sensitive about the optimistic feelings caused by the growing influence of the new thinking in international relations. The sharply negative speech at the session by NATO Secretary General M. Woerner, that faithful guardian of the military bloc's old dogmas, came as no surprise to anyone. Since these forces are relatively influential and must on no account be underestimated, I will permit myself to return to Mr Woerner's speech, the full text of which has just been issued by the news agencies.

On studying it you cannot help recalling the satirical lines in Kozma Prutkov's comical "German Ballad:" "Year after year... Baron von Grinvaldus, that valiant knight, sits in the same position on his stone."

Mr Woerner, former Bundeswehr air force lieutenant colonel and for many years FRG defense minister, also maintains the same "position" year after year: Spiritual calm would return to him only when the status quo established in Europe as a result of World War II was destroyed, and the whole of Europe was restructured in the image and semblance of the "West." "The status quo," he stated at the North Atlantic Assembly session, "suited Soviet interests; the West has nothing to lose, it could only gain, if it was ended."

Hence, he declares, the idea of a "common European home" proposed by M.S. Gorbachev, based on peaceful coexistence between states belonging to different social systems, is unacceptable: After all, this idea, as Mr Woerner puts it, "is based on the ideological division of Europe; and the Eastern part of Europe is associated with Gorbachev's 'socialism.' That has little in common with the Atlantic alliance's idea of the future Europe."

The NATO secretary general does not consider it necessary to conceal how he and his supporters would like to see this "future Europe:" "East and West," he stated, "will be reconciled, not by meeting somewhere in the middle, as some people think. The debate is being conducted **wholly and entirely on our (!) terms. Our (!) values and ideals and our systems hold the key to the political and economic future of the Soviet Union and its allies. This is a reality (?!) which the communist leaders must reckon with**" (my emphasis—Yu.Zh.).

Those are the ideological terms for cooperation that Mr Woerner offers the "East" on behalf of the "West." They are closely linked with a military political condition that he ventures to put forward: This is the "total restructuring of relations," as he puts it, on the basis of... unilateral disarmament by the European socialist countries. Here it is—once again, I quote his speech at the North Atlantic Assembly session:

"First, and most important. The Warsaw Pact must reduce its forces in Eastern Europe to a level where aggression becomes impossible."

But what about reducing NATO forces?

Mr Woerner avoids answering that question directly. He welcomes the accords reached during conversations between our foreign minister and the U.S. President and secretary of state, and expresses hope for success at the talks in Vienna and Geneva. But he then makes the highly significant reservation that arms control and diplomacy are not enough to ensure security.... "They should be based on firm defense," Mr Woerner explains.

He promptly makes an angry attack on the NATO members who are supposedly in a hurry to disarm (which I, frankly, have not noticed yet). "I will not conceal my concern," the NATO secretary general said anxiously, "at the trend that can now be observed in the majority of our alliance's member countries, which are embarking (?) on a unilateral reduction in their defense efforts.... This is wrong and dangerous."

It is curious that immediately after this speech Mr Woerner flew to the United States to take part in a conference on the subject of "NATO—Partnership and Prospects." Last Wednesday he met with the U.S. President. As a White House spokesman told journalists, the main attention at this meeting was devoted to the question of relations between the members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Mr Woerner, for his part, added meaningfully that "the changes in the East European countries are a challenge to NATO's traditional military role," that the NATO bloc should remain the "main source of stability," and that "only with NATO's existence can stability in the world be strengthened," while NATO "should be regarded as an instrument for political control (?!) of the changes in East-West relations."

Please note: "An instrument for **control** of changes in relations." A formula that is, in my view, strange, to put it mildly, whereby the concepts of dialogue, discussion, and the quest for mutually acceptable solutions are supplanted by the concepts of control and the imposition of decisions advantageous to one side without regard for the other side's position. And this formula is, in any event, far removed from the principles that formed the basis of the recent accords acheived in Washington and Jackson.

It is all the more important now not to relax efforts to implement these Soviet-American accords by ensuring not in words, but in practice a transition from mutual understanding to mutual action between our states and between "West" and "East" in general!

Arab States Try To Block Israeli UN Membership

LD1710225489 Moscow TASS in English 2233 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov:

The United Nations General Assembly approved without voting on Tuesday the report of the Credentials Committee on the delegations attending the 44th session.

A group of Arab and some other Islamic countries made a traditional attempt to disrupt the approval of the Israeli delegation credentials by proposing an amendment to the draft resolution on the Credentials Committee report.

According to their opinion, voiced by a Libyan representative, the Israeli policy illustrates that Israel is not a peaceful state and does not fulfill its obligations under the U.N. Charter.

Following this move, another traditional step was taken—a procedural motion was made not to vote on the amendment proposed by the Arab countries.

The motion was supported by 95 countries, with 37 voting against and 15 delegations abstaining from voting.

The representatives of the Soviet Union, Belorussia and the Ukraine, who earlier voted against the proposal, abstained this time.

TASS was informed by Soviet representatives that the stance of the Soviet Union is accounted for by its new universal approach to international organisations.

In keeping with the new approach, principles of new politcal thinking are given priority. These include deideologisation of interstate relations.

According to the opinion of the Soviet Union, international organisations should be transformed from places of confrontational polemics between states into forums for joint identification and settlement of present problems.

The stance of the Soviet Union concerning the Middle East issue remains unchanged. The Soviet Union favours its comprehensive settlement at an international conference with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organisation and the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council.

It is noted in the U.N. community that on the previous day, even Arab countries' representatives voiced doubts as to the advisability of proposing an amendment aimed at disrupting the approval by the session of the Israeli delegation credentials.

These doubts were also voiced during the voting at the United Nations General Assembly session.

United States & Canada

First U.S. Business Exposition Opens in Moscow

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Attend Exhibition

PM1810135089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Invitation to Cooperation"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and N.I. Rzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, took part in the opening ceremony of the first national commercial exhibition by American companies, "U.S.-89: Opportunities for Business Cooperation," on 17 October.

Some 150 large corporations and medium-sized and small companies from the United States are taking part in the exhibition, which is organized by the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council [ASTEC]. More than 900 American businessmen have come to Moscow to establish business contacts with Soviet organizations. A wide range of goods and technologies are on show at the exhibition, from the latest models of cars and road building equipment to food and food processing equipment, complex instruments, and medical products.

M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov viewed the exhibits.

After that, they met with representatives of a number of American companies and leaders of ASTEC. The participants in the meeting exchanged opinions on a wide range of trade and economic relations between the two countries, in a constructive and frank spirit.

The American businessmen were told that in a rapidly changing world the positive trend in our interstate relations has received a new impetus. But trade and economic relations are left out of the general network of collaboration, lagging patently behind the political dialogue.

The need for the rapid creation of legal foundations for mutual economic cooperation was also stressed. Here it is important to do away with all discriminatory fetters in this sphere.

Confidence was expressed on the part of the Soviet leadership that the current economic reform in the country and the new forms of cooperation that are being put forward form a firm basis for economic collaboration between our two countries, offer good prospects for American firms, and generate a dramatic new development in this sphere.

The American participants expressed their desire to work more actively in the direction of regaining their positions in the Soviet market which were lost over the years when Soviet-U.S. political relations were characterized by instability and periods of ups and downs. They declared their interest in developing large-scale, long-term cooperation with Soviet organizations through the creation of trading consortiums of joint enterprises, on the basis, among other things, of the modernization of Soviet plants. In this context it was noted with satisfaction that a process of stepping up the creation of joint Soviet-American enterprises has begun this year, and the total number of such enterprises has now reached around 100.

At the same time the participants agreed that the present scope of economic collaboration is not yet in line with the two countries' mighty potential, and that there are substantial unutilized opportunities for the further expansion of Soviet-American cooperation in the trade and economic sphere. There was an exchange of opinions on a number of specific projects for business cooperation. Considerable attention was devoted to questions of ecology and the formulation of appropriate legislation.

The representatives of business circles called on both governments to make questions of trade and economic cooperation the subject of constant discussion at all levels of bilateral dialogue, up to the very highest.

The Soviet side expressed understanding of this view of the matter and expressed the hope that this approach will be shared by the American leadership.

M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov answered numerous questions from American participants concerning the current reforms in the Soviet economy and in foreign economic relations.

The following took part in the exhibition's opening ceremony: on the American side—K. Evans, special assistant to the U.S. President; J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR; D. Andreas, cochairman of ASTEC; and company leaders J. Murphy of Dresser Industries, C. Hugel of Combustion Engineering, P. Van Orden of General Electric, and J. Giffen of the American trade consortium; on the Soviet side—V.L. Malkevich, chairman of the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry Presidium; K.F. Katushev, USSR Minister of foreign economic relations; F.A. Tabeyev, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers; and A.F. Dobrynin, adviser to the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman.

Gorbachev Tours Displays

LD1810011189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Oct 89

[A. Sturua video report on the 17 October opening in Krasnaya Presnya, Moscow of an exhibition entitled "U.S.-89: Potential for Business Cooperation"; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Sturua] The opening ceremony was attended by Comrades Gorbachev and Ryzhkov; (?Cooper Evans), special representative of the U.S. president; Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union; and other officials. [video shows Ryzhkov and Gorbachev, with Dobrynin behind them]

About 150 U.S. companies and firms are taking part in this national commercial exhibition. Its nature is not merely demonstrative but also businessmaking, which reflects the views of the U.S. business circles which unambiguously favor the development of mutually-beneficial contacts and ties. The U.S. guests are displaying here their achievements in such areas as agricultural production automation and food processing, manufacture of advanced medical equipment and construction industry, extraction of coal, oil and gas and computer technology, various forms of transportation and manufacture of various consumer goods.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov viewed the displays and talked to representatives of American companies.

[?Gorbachev] Hello.

[First unidentified man] Esteemed Ladies and Gentlemen, we are very happy to welcome you at our Caterpillar stand. Challenger 65. Take a look, please.

[Gorbachev] Have you had it working in your country?

[First unidentified man] This tractor has undergone a year of trials here in Soviet Union. It worked in Tashkent and in Odessa.

[Gorbachev] Well, you chose nice warm places. [laughter]

[First unidentified man] That's correct. Well,...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] But we also have some marshes up north.

[First unidentified man] That's correct. [words indistinct]

[Gorbachev] And did it do well?

[First unidentified man] Very well. It did as well as tractor class 8.

[Gorbachev] And what's the range of its applications?

[First unidentified man] Just a moment. Victor, please.

[Second unidentified man] This tractor is mainly used as an agricultural tractor for plowing.

[Gorbachev] So it's for plowing.

[Second unidentified man] That's right. Agricultural plowing.

[Gorbachev] (?And you can) attach [words indistinct] for combined applications?

[Second unidentified man] That's right. For a new line of agricultural appliances.

[Gorbachev] So you can use several types of equipment. What's its power?

[Second unidentified man] Two-hundred-and-seventy horse power. [indistinct interjection]

[Gorbachev] I see.

[First unidentified man] If you like, go ahead please. It has a very comfortable cab.

[Gorbachev] Thank you. That's very interesting. After all, I myself am a machine operator. But we'll refrain. [laughter]

[Video shows Gorbachev discussing a yellow tractor with a group of men, with Ryzhkov occasionally visible behind him].

[Gorbachev] So what has brought you to our country, to the Soviet Union? What are you hoping for?

[First unidentified woman, speaking in English with translation into Russian] Business relations and beautiful women. [laughter]

[Gorbachev] And is anything shaping up? Are you here only to trade or to do something together?

[First unidentified woman] We are discussing doing something, too. And we are getting ready to open our first perfume shop in the Soviet Union.

[Gorbachev] Well, we welcome a shop but we also need to cooperate here, so that there is production. That's very important.

[First unidentified woman] We are involved in that.

[Gorbachev] You are experienced people.

[First unidentified woman] We have already reached the stage of contract negotiation.

[Gorbachev] Well, go ahead, put down your roots. [laughter]

[Video shows Estee Lauder display; Gorbachev, with Ryzhkov at his side, talking to the first unidentified woman, shaking hands]

[Second unidentified woman, speaking in English with translation into Russian] We are very proud to be the first in this respect. We are hoping to establish and then to continue our work in the USSR on a stable basis.

[Gorbachev] I should say that if you get into this market here, you'll have great prospects. Now, of course, everything in our country is being reconsidered, restructured. First they used to ask for independence and we gave it to them. And they didn't know what to do with it. When they got it they didn't know what to do with it.

[Second unidentified woman] They know what to do.

[Gorbachev] But now they have got their things going so that we've got to hold them back now and then. It turns out that our directors, our specialists have a strong enterpreneurial streak.

I think that all in all if our enterprises are equipped with equipment and technology on a par with the best Western enterprises, great things could be done.

[Second unidentified woman] We have seen some Soviet products and goods and consider that they very much come up to international standards.

[Gorbachev] Once they feel that they are entering another market with their product the processes here will also go a different way. But in the meantime this is how things in our country are going. There used to be a time when we produced an annual growth in goods to the value of 6 to 10 to 12 billion rubles. And the situation in the market used to be more-or-less stable. Last year we produced growth in goods turnover worth 24 billion. And this year we shall probably have no less than 29.

[Ryzhkov] Thirty.

[Gorbachev] Thirty billion but all our shops are empty.

[Ryzhkov] Sales have grown 10 percent this year.

[Gorbachev] Sales have grown 10 percent in a year, this year. A great amount of money has appeared in the market. But I think it's not only that but probably also the fact that the market somehow became unstable. We did not pay due attention to that, we thought it was a transitory phenomenon. And that caused a great many uncontrolled phenomena in the market and now we have the (?effects). There is uncertainty. Anything that appears in the market, people try to hoard as soon as possible and there is simply a shortage of goods. Today the problem of the market is our number one problem. And that's the direction in which we are reorienting our entire economy. I am telling you this to give you something to think about.

Well, let's end here. This seems like a good place to end. It's good that you are (?already building next door.) [video shows Gorbachev, with Ryzhkov by his side and Dobrynin in the background, talking to a group of people]

U.S. Businessmen See 'Historic Opportunity'

PM1710105589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Oct 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Removing Obstacles"]

[Text] Washington, 16 Oct—The changes taking place in the Soviet Union as a result of perestroyka create a historic opportunity for the U.S. business world to develop equal trade and economic relations with the USSR. This was the conclusion reached by the compilers of the prestigious report "Current Business Prospects for Trade with the Soviet Union" published in the United States by the Committee for U.S.-Soviet Relations. They unanimously advocate the eradication of obstacles in the way of normalizing trade and economic relations between the USSR and the United States, and the building of new bridges to expand U.S.-Soviet trade.

Many of the businessmen who took part in drawing up the report advocate the elimination of such a legacy of the "cold war" as the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which hampers the development of bilateral trade. John Jacobs, administrative director of the Chamber of Commerce in San Francisco, one of the most important industrial and financial centers on the Pacific coast of the United States, considers it necessary to immediately grant the USSR most-favored-nation status.

Dwayne Andreas, cochairman of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council [ASTEC], stresses that the more than 300 companies and banks comprising the council are showing heightened interest in expanding trade with the Soviet Union. Representatives of U.S. business circles, he notes, are well-informed about the "enormous changes" taking place in the USSR. However, trade relations between our countries leave much to be desired. Currently the volume of bilateral trade barely exceeds $2 billion. But given a "radical change for the better," ASTEC president James Giffen believes, this volume could reach $10-15 billion in the next few years.

Baker on 'Historic Opportunity' for Relations

PM1810112289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Historic Opportunity"]

[Text] New York, 17 Oct—Today the United States and the USSR really have a historic opportunity to achieve a stable improvement in their relations, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker said, addressing members of the Foreign Policy Association in New York.

Noting that "relations with the Soviet Union have improved considerably since 1985, when Mikhail Gorbachev began perestroyka," the head of the U.S. foreign policy department dwelt in detail on the broad transformations now taking place in the USSR.

Stressing that "the nature of perestroyka itself goes beyond exclusively internal transformations" and that these are indissolubly linked with the new thinking in foreign policy, J. Baker noted: "We have a chance to leave behind the postwar period of 'cold war,' which was full of ups and downs. We can go beyond the policy of deterrence, in order to make the changes for the better in superpower relations more reliable and less reversible."

On this basis, the U.S. secretary of state identified five areas of the quest for Soviet-American rapprochement, first among which, in the administration's opinion, is the resolution of Europe's problems.

A second area of the quest for Soviet-American mutual understanding, in his opinion, is the settlement of regional conflicts. Each of this is to some degree fraught with the danger of becoming an arena of superpower rivalry and a source of tension, J. Baker said. Neither the

United States nor the Soviet Union, with perestroyka in full swing, has an interest in becoming involved in such conflicts.

The secretary of state expressed U.S. readiness to act jointly with the USSR in the cause of reducing the risk of outbreak of war. He stressed that at strategic nuclear arms talks the United States will continue to place the main emphasis on reducing those types of weapons that are most suitable for inflicting a first strike, and fight for those arms that are less suitable for this purpose, such as bombers.

J. Baker identified the fourth sphere of prospects for mutually advantageous cooperation as the development of dialogue on global problems, primarily in the sphere of environmental conservation.

"Lastly," J. Baker said in conclusion, "we have begun to study a fifth potential sphere in which we could find mutual benefit. This relates to internal aspects of perestroyka" in the USSR. The secretary of state said that the United States "is ready to give the Soviet Union technical assistance in certain spheres of economic reform." He once again mentioned the promise to lift the discriminatory Jackson-Vanik amendment, which hampers the development of trade between the two countries, but he noted that G. Bush's administration regards the discussion of the question of the USSR's joining international financial organizations as premature.

TASS Cites Baker on 'Opportunity'

LD1710104489 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 17 TASS—By TASS correspondents Igor Makurin and Andrey Sitov:

"We now have a historic opportunity with the Soviet Union" to achieve a lasting and stable improvement of relations, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker told the U.S. Foreign Policy Association in New York on Monday.

Noting the complexity of U.S.-Soviet relations Baker said "we have the chance to leave behind the post-war period with the ups and downs of the cold war."

"Our task is to find enduring points of mutual advantage that serve the interests of both the United States and the Soviet Union," he stressed.

He outlined five areas in which U.S.-Soviet rapprochement can be achieved. One of these concerns the solving of European problems.

This programme involves, in particular, "an accelerated timetable for an agreement on conventional force reductions in Europe that would correct existing asymmetries and reduce the risks of surprise attack, redraw the European security map and help perestroika in the Soviet Union, as Moscow can save billions on conventional forces."

"A second major point where we must search for mutual advantage with the Soviets concerns regional conflicts," Baker said.

"Each of these bears to some degree the potential for becoming the scene of superpower rivalry and tension. Neither the United States nor a Soviet Union in the midst of perestroika has an interest in being drawn into such conflicts," he stressed.

Passing over to arms control, Baker said "we can work with the soviets to lower the risk of war." However, he stressed that at negotiations on strategic nuclear weapons, the United States will continue focusing "on reducing the risk of war by lowering the incentives for surprise attack, not arms reductions in and of themselves."

Baker recalled that the administration is ready to revise its "ban on mobile missiles, because mobile missiles if effectively verified enhance stability."

Dwelling on the fourth point of mutual advantage, Baker singled out a dialogue on "global issues, especially the environment."

Finally Baker spoke on "perestroyka's internal aspects." "We are ready to provide technical assistance in certain areas of Soviet economic reform," he noted.

Baker promised again "to waive the Jackson-Vanik amendment", but said that the Bush administration "see discussions about Soviet membership in GATT or the other international financial institutions as premature."

Baker Notes Improvement of U.S.-USSR Relations

PM1810125189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Relations Analyzed"]

[Text] New York, 17 Oct—The United States and the USSR today have an historic opportunity to achieve a stable improvement in their relations, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker declared.

Noting that "relations with the Soviet Union have significantly improved since 1985, when Mikhail Gorbachev launched perestroyka," the chief of the U.S. foreign policy department dwelt in detail on the large-scale transformations now taking place in the USSR. He emphasized that perestroyka has become "the Soviet answer to a fast-changing world." In the secretary of state's opinion, "the actual logic of this perestroyka demands that Soviet people solve their problems by themselves in a comprehensive and natural way... Therefore perestroyka differs from earlier but unsuccessful attempts at transformations in the state founded by Lenin and built by Stalin." Consequently, "the Soviet problems do not lend themselves to bailing out [spaseniye] from abroad by means of generous Western credits. This policy failed during Brezhnev's era of stagnation."

U.S. Attorney General Thornburgh Pays Visit

Sukharev-Thornburgh Meeting

LD1610211189 Moscow TASS in English 2044 GMT 16 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 16 TASS—The visit to the USSR by a delegation of the U.S. Department of Justice headed by Secretary of Justice Richard Thornburgh is a remarkable step in the development of relations between the two countries, a step that is of special importance now that the legal reform is being implemented in the USSR.

Aleksandr Sukharev, Soviet prosecutor-general, said this today at a meeting with the U.S. secretary of justice.

Sukharev noted that the reform presupposes the study and use of everything valuable that has been accumulated by the world civilisation in the area of law. He said the experience of the United States is of much interest.

Sukharev spoke about the history and present-day activities of the Public Prosecutor's Office in the USSR. He said that many fundamental principles of its activity laid down by Lenin were seriously distorted in the post-revolutionary years.

The USSR prosecutor-general said that intensive work is now conducted in the USSR to adjust the activity of the Public Prosecutor's Office to the tasks set by perestroika.

The prosecutor-general said that problems of human rights and freedoms are priority problems. The problem of combatting crime is acute, too.

U.S. Secretary of Justice Richard Thornburgh described today's meeting as a historic one. He said he highly appreciated the possibility to get a first-hand knowledge about the activity of law enforcement bodies in the Soviet Union.

Thornburgh said that law enforcement bodies of the two countries should cooperate. This would help them tackle more effectively the problems that face the two countries and that become more numerous.

Thornburgh said the USSR and the U.S. had already earmarked a number of priority areas of interaction, the most important of which are the problems of combatting narcotics traffick and international terrorism and cooperating in environmental protection.

More on Sukharev-Thornburgh Talks

PM1810130189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[S. Kosterin report: "Priority to the Individual. Dialogue Between Soviet and American Legal Experts"]

[Text] This auditorium has mainly known difficult discussions, but yesterday, 16 October, you would have heard a mixture of gentle joking and serious, sometimes very specialized discussion. The discussion was conducted by USSR General Prosecutor A.Ya. Sukharev and Mr Richard Thornburgh, U.S. attorney general, who is visiting our country to familiarize himself with the Soviet law enforcement system.

The conversation was trustful, frank, and interesting. Not only for the guest from the United States, of course, but also for the Soviet specialists and representatives of the press invited to attend the meeting. The USSR general prosecutor shared not only his experience but also his thoughts and concerns as a legal expert and an ordinary individual. He spoke with pain, for example, of how our prosecutor's office deviated from Leninist principles during the years of Stalinism.

"We are now," A.Ya. Sukharev said, "reviewing the concept of supervision by the prosecutor's office and changing the structure of the prosecutor's office itself to bring it into line with the requirements of perestroyka. We are in favor of the prosecutor's office giving precedence to the question of defending rights and freedoms and providing legal guarantees for perestroyka. Priority is being given to the defense of human rights.

"New aspects are being introduced into supervision by the prosecutor's office. These include defense of human rights in the ecological sphere. More than 30 environmental protection prosecutor's offices are now established in our country and a special administration has been created in the USSR Prosecutor's Office. Supervision by the prosecutor's office of the observance of legality in the social sphere (health care, trade, culture, consumer services, and education) is forging a path for itself. Economic reform has prompted new laws. But there are also strata in the bureaucracy and apparatus which have no wish to switch to the new economic management system. This is where prosecutor's office supervision is needed. Labor collective councils are now being set up at enterprises. If they gain real authority, the reforms will make more rapid progress.

"This is not the only side to defending human rights," the general prosecutor continued. "In the United States and in our own country, there are many who love to impose administrative penalties on people. Approximately 60 million people are penalized this way in the Soviet Union every year and almost 300 organs and organizations have the right to impose fines. We have set up a special service to monitor this phenomenon: After all, this has direct bearing on defense of human rights."

The U.S. attorney general presented his hosts with a book on the U.S. legal system and did not venture to repeat well-known facts but, in his turn, frankly expressed his concerns.

"All three branches—the legislature, the judiciary, and the executive," Mr Thornburgh said, "have always had an uneasy relationship in the United States. Yes, it does sometimes happen that a case does not reach the courts. The system is such that each branch (of the three) checks the decisions made by the others. Sometimes we resolve a problem simply by not resolving it."

The conversation lasted for about 2 hours. Journalists were essentially there in the role of observers; a special audience with the U.S. attorney general has been arranged for the press for later on. Nevertheless, after the official part, I managed to ask the guest a question on behalf of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA readers:

[Correspondent] Could you tell us please, Mr Secretary, whether a situation, in which Congress disagrees with a case decided by the Justice Department and demands a review, is possible in the United States?

[Thornburgh] Our country's Congress can do two things. It can exercise its right to monitor proceedings and check how the Justice Department has resolved a particular case. It can change our decision by issuing a law. We are not completely independent.

The U.S. attorney general assessed the significance of his visit to our country, during which questions of common concern will be discussed, as a historic visit. The attorney general is to be acquainted with other Soviet law enforcement organs.

Kryuchkov Receives Thornburgh

LD1710200989 Moscow TASS in English
1947 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR State Security Committee (KGB) and member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, received today U.S. Attorney-General Richard Thornburgh.

They discussed issues of mutual interest.

PRAVDA Reports on Thornburgh Talks

PM1810141389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Reception for U.S. Attorney General"]

[Text] N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received U.S. Attorney General R. Thornburgh, who has arrived in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Justice Ministry to familiarize himself with the Soviet legal and judicial system and establish business ties between both countries' justice organs.

During their conversation they broached a number of questions linked with the formation of a socialist rule-of-law state in the USSR and the implementation of extensive legal reform designed to ensure the supremacy of the law in all spheres of the life of society.

The U.S. attorney general's attention was drawn to the fact that substantial changes are being made to legislation on a broad range of questions in conditions of the humanization and democratization of public life and new economic relations. In the course of the implementation of legal reform the comprehensive broadening of Soviet people's political, economic, and social rights and freedoms is coming to the fore. Vigorous work has been mounted to implement the Vienna accords in the humanitarian and legal spheres and bring a number of statutes and administrative regulations into line with the Soviet Union's pledges under international human rights pacts.

Both sides expressed satisfaction at the activation of USSR-U.S. relations and the recent accord on a new Soviet-U.S. summit.

N.I. Ryzhkov and R. Thornburgh exchanged opinions on the state of affairs in the humanitarian sphere of Soviet-U.S. relations, noting that a frank businesslike approach provides an opportunity to promptly eliminate questions as they arise. With regard to the role and place of the two countries' judicial services in the overall scheme of bilateral contacts, it was noted that it would be desirable to broaden exchange of experience among USSR and U.S. jurists in the future in the sphere of legislative and law enforcement activity and also on questions of juridical backup for Soviet-U.S. cooperation and ties in various spheres, including the sphere of trade and economic relations.

V.F. Yakovlev, USSR minister of justice; V.V. Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs; and J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

On the same day R. Thornburgh received V.A. Kryuchkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR KGB. In the course of the conversation they discussed questions of mutual interest. V.F. Yakovlev and J. Matlock took part in the conversation.

Yakovlev, Thornburgh Hold Meeting

LD1610192389 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1530 GMT 16 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The stay in the USSR of U.S. Attorney General Richard Thornburgh, is continuing. Here is a report by Yuriy Rostov:

[Rostov] This is the first visit in history by a U.S. Attorney General to the Soviet Union. As was stressed today during talks, the United States has no small experience in the defense of the rights of both individual citizens and society as a whole, through precisely determined laws. In our country, the role of the judicial bodies must now expand sharply, and positive U.S. experience could be used. Here is how the Soviet justice minister and the U.S. attorney general outline the range of matters discussed.

[Begin recording] [Thornburgh, in English with superimposed Russian translation] On the agenda are the problems of organized crime, drugs, protection of the environment, and legal structures themselves. All this in the context of the hope for strengthening the role of law expressed by Gorbachev.

[V. Yakovlev, USSR justice minister] U.S. justice has great experience in formulating major programs, not only in formulating them but also the implementation of major programs for combatting organized crime, narcotics, and so on.

[Rostov] This is a very topical issue at the moment.

[Yakovlev] A very topical issue. All this started earlier in the United States and they have more experience in this area. I think that here we could both look at this experience and, most importantly, enter into cooperation. [end recording] [video shows meeting at which U.S. Ambassador Matlock is present, and interview]

CIA Head Seeks 'Free Hand' in Operations Abroad

LD1710103589 Moscow TASS in English 0934 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 17 TASS—Director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency William Webster has called upon President Bush and Congress to discuss granting more freedom for the CIA to support coups abroad, THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper reports today.

In an interview with the newspaper, Webster said that the thirteen-year-old presidential Executive Order barring U.S. involvement in terrorist acts, has been interpreted as a ban on U.S. participation in coups that could result in the death of a country's leader, even if this happens in an armed conflict.

The Executive Order was issued in 1976 by former U.S. President Gerald Ford after a congressional investigation on the CIA's role in attempts to assassinate Cuban President Fidel Castro and other foreign leaders.

The newspaper believes that Webster's efforts to win a free hand for CIA operations abroad were prompted by the failure of the Panamanian coup.

Webster Harks Back to Cold War

LD1710225189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2044 GMT 17 Oct 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Excerpt] No one could be in any doubt, I suppose, regarding the warming of the political atmosphere in the past few years, and the improvement and normalization of international relations. And yet occasionally one hears some shrill voice reminding one of the times of the cold war and the imperious ambitions of Washington, to the effect that not everyone in America likes the changes taking place in the world. An example of this could be the recent statement of CIA Director William Webster, who called on the president and U.S. Congress to duscuss the possibility of giving the CIA more freedom to support potential coups abroad.

Obviously he was thinking of the recent events in Panama. This was reported today by THE NEW YORK TIMES. In an interview with the paper, the head of the U.S. intelligence department said that the Presidential Decree in force for 13 years now preventing U.S. interference in terrorist acts has till now been interpreted as a complete ban on giving help to any rebellion abroad which could lead to the death of the leader of the said country, even if that happened during an armed clash. And when Webster was talking about this, the paper's correspondent asked him whether in Webster's opinion the said decree should be relaxed. The director replied, note his language: I do not think you have misunderstood me. So he admitted that he was for CIA participation in mutinies, for permitting the CIA to take part in mutinies on the territory of other states. [passage omitted]

Planned Indianapolis-Riga Trial Flight Hits Snags

PM1710104589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Special correspondents I. Litvinova and V. Zaykin report under the rubric "From Competent Sources": "Will a Lockheed Land in Riga?"]

[Text] Riga-Moscow—The American Trans Air company, the Latvian firms "Inzhener" and "Avialat," and the Soviet-West German firm "Ring" want to cooperate in sphere of international air traffic. They have held talks and signed protocols on their intention to set up a joint venture and arrange organizational questions. A Lockheed 1011 aircraft was ready to make a trial run from Indianapolis to Riga, but it suddenly encountered an insuperable obstacle.

This obstacle, according to the interested parties, is the Ministry of Civil Aviation. Looking through their business correspondence, you could conclude that this is indeed the case.

Have people really thrown a wrench in the works of a useful initiative?... You could even say a salutary initiative. Given the current shortage of flights to the United States, whereby people who have decided to change their citizenship spend months at Sheremetyevo-2 waiting for a flight, and tickets for private trips can currently only be bought for flights leaving in January, the appearance of a new joint venture could seemingly only be welcomed. So why has it not been supported? We went to the Ministry of Civil Aviation for an answer.

"The principle of reciprocity operates in Soviet-U.S. relations in the sphere of air transport," L. Seliverstov, chief of the Ministry of Civil Aviation Foreign Relations Administration, said. "Air traffic is under the control of the U.S. State Department and the USSR Foreign Ministry through the Ministry of Civil Aviation. American Trans Air could only be given permission for a trial run after corresponding talks between these organs."

IZVESTIYA asked its correspondent in the United States to ask the State Department to comment on this situation. Here is what a spokesman for the Soviet Department said: "The bilateral agreement between the USSR and the United States does not include provisions regulating charter flights. We look at each specific instance of Aeroflot charters and, as a rule, give our consent. Soviet official organs act in the same way. And, as far as we are aware, take a favorable attitude. I would add that, in the absence of a charter flight agreement, each government has the sovereign right to agree to a flight or not." [speaker ends]

"But in our case it is not so much a question of a commercial charter requested by the U.S. company. There would be no problem about that," L. Seliverstov explained. "It was a question of a trial run. This could only be carried out provided there were an official intergovernmental agreement on regular air traffic on this specific carrier.

"I would tell you that the Ministry of Civil Aviation has suggested that its U.S. colleagues expand the geographical spread of flights for both sides. We want Americans to be able to fly to Riga, Minsk, and Kiev. And, in turn, we want to fly to Los Angeles, Chicago, and Boston ourselves. I would inform you that around the end of November the Ministry of Civil Aviation and the U.S. State Department plan to hold talks on increasing air traffic between the two countries."

[Correspondents] Some people are of the opinion that Aeroflot is a company with a monopoly on air traffic in the USSR and will make every effort to prevent competition...

[Selverstov] This is not true. First, under the Law on the Enterprise (Association) all civil aviation administrations have become economically autonomous and are to all intents and purposes independent of the ministry. Were it not for the shortage of fuel and aircraft they would be firms that could really compete with each other.

And second, the questions of setting up air enterprises to compete with Aeroflot are currently being worked out. They would use foreign aircraft and would not be dependent on the fuel problems that arise in our country.

China

U.S. Video of PRC Prodemocracy Captives Shown

LD1710194189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 17 Oct 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] For a long time the dramatic events that were played out in Tiananmen Square in Beijing—you remember, at the beginning of last June, 3 June—were almost completely excluded from treatment by journalists in the PRC. Hardly anything was said about them. It was known that after the clash between students and troops in those days in June, during the carnage that occurred at that time, a considerable number, hundreds of people were arrested and sent for trial. Some of them were executed. But this video report filmed by cameramen of the U.S. company CNN tells us about the fate of the others. The film was made with the permission of the Chinese authorities, of course, in one of the prison institutions in the Chinese republic. [video shows young people in a court room, a prison entrance and prison inmates at work]

PRC's Ni Zhifu Ends USSR Visit

90UI0047A Moscow TRUD in Russian 13 Oct 89 p 3

[Ye. Shaukatov report: "Visit Ends"]

[Text] An official friendly visit to our country by a delegation from the All-China Federation of Trade Unions [ACFTU] led by ACFTU chairman Ni Zhifu has successfully ended.

On 12 October final talks took place with a delegation of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU]. The great importance of the development of Soviet-Chinese trade union links and their contribution in strengthening friendship and cooperation between our countries was noted.

A meeting took place in the Palace of Labor between representatives of the ACFTU and the Moscow trade union aktiv. In his speech at the meeting AUCCTU chairman S.A. Shalayev emphasized that all Soviet people are pleased with the normalization of relations between the two states. It is also time to "close the past and open the future" in our trade union links. He expressed profound satisfaction with the results of the meetings and talks that had taken place during the course of the Chinese delegation's visit. He indicated that on many issues the positions of the AUCCTU and the ACFTU are close or coincide.

In his speech the leader of the Chinese delegation noted that the Chinese have experienced and still experience a feeling of friendship toward the Soviet people. Ni Zhifu told those present about the current situation in China and the activity of the Chinese trade unions under the conditions of the implementation of the economic reforms, and he expressed his conviction that cooperation between the two trade union centers would be strengthened in the future.

PRC Army Said Reorganizing, Trimming Forces

90UI0039A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 41 14-20 Oct 89 p 2

[Article by V. Smolko: "The PRC: An Army on Cost Accounting?"]

[Text] In the Chinese program of "four modernizations," the modernization of the Army stands in one of the last places. However, as is believed in China, the role of military reform is one of the much higher economic priorities because the entire course of restructuring in the country depends, in no small degree, on its successful realization.

Originally, military reform affected the higher Army echelons. The PRC Main Military Council was established in 1982. Its mission included the management of all the country's Armed Forces, which consist of the PLA [People's Liberation Army], the national armed police, and the people's volunteer corps. It was at that time that minor components of the Army, on which a substantial part of the country's military budget was expended, began to be abolished. The main construction troops and railway and border troops were removed from the PLA, which improved the balance of services of the Armed Forces and branches of troops and made it possible to reduce the numerical strength of the PLA substantially without damage to its combat capability.

In June of 1985, a decision was made on the reduction of the Army by one million persons, and a program was approved for the further restructuring of the PLA's organizational structure. Along with the decrease in troop strength, provision was made for a reduction in the number of military districts from 11 to 7, a reorganization of large troop formations and units, and the conversion of military plants.

Analysis of the military-political situation in the world and its forecast for the future have led the Chinese leadership to the conclusion that the country is unlikely to become involved in a world conflict in the next 50 years. In the opinion of Chinese political analysts, China has been given a long-range breathing spell, and it can now concentrate on efforts to modernize the country economically. According to Chinese press reports, the reduction of the Chinese Army by one million persons lasted until the end of 1987 (it was not easy to arrange jobs for such a mass of people under conditions of a continuing two percent unemployment, and at the present time the numerical strength of the PLA is about three million. A further reduction of the Army is planned to the level of the mid-1960's (2.5 million persons).

The perfection of military equipment and weapons is one of the main directions in the modernization of the Chinese Army, inasmuch as it will then be possible to resolve successfully the mission of "minimal deterrence" of a probable enemy. Of the military-technical programs, special attention is being given to the improvement of the nuclear forces of the Chinese Army. At the beginning of the 1980's, "Dongfen-5" missiles with a flight range of up to 12 kilometers began to enter the weapons inventory of PLA missile troops, and solid fuel versions of this missile underwent testing.

In 1986, after 5 years of testing, a new nuclear submarine was put into operation. In 1988 the launch of the first weather satellite "Fengyun-1" was conducted which, together with the launch of a new communications satellite in the PRC, was categorized as "a major test in the area of defense science and technology."

The solid fuel operational-tactical missile M-9 (according to Western classification), with a flight range of about 600 km, was recently developed in China, and the Chinese intend to sell its export version abroad. Particular attention should be given to the development of this type of nuclear missile in conjunction with the total destruction of a similar class of missiles in the USSR and the United States in the near future .

Plans for the development of the Navy for the period up to the end of this century envisage the creation of new ships, nuclear and non-nuclear submarines, and naval aviation, including aircraft carriers. The Chinese Navy now has 5 nuclear and 113 conventional submarines, 44 main class surface ships, and a large number of coastal defense vessels. In addition, the Navy has three naval infantry divisions. From time to time, submarines and ocean-going vessels with Chinese identification appear in various areas of the Pacific and Indian oceans, demonstrating the growing capability of Chinese naval forces. As far back as 1978, the Chinese set the task of switching military branches onto civilian production tracks. However, the conversion did not begin to be implemented until January of 1986 when defense plants received appropriate directives. At the present time, two-thirds of all military plants put out civilian products, and the profits from their sales go toward the modernization of the Chinese Army.

It was announced in China in 1988 that the PLA "no longer organizes voluntary work on the construction of civilian facilities," and that henceforth this kind of service will be allowed on a contract basis. This system was also applied to scientific research and design work in the area of military equipment and weapons. The Chinese did away with the "rationing system" of orders for the production and development of weapons, which was extremely inefficient. The contract system is based on cost accounting development of military equipment and weapons. Already 80 percent of all military scientific-technical programs have been switched to the contract system. In the opinion of Chinese specialists, the contract system in the Army has indisputable advantages that make it possible to save financial resources and achieve modernization of military equipment and weapons. Apparently conversion and cost accounting are an important channel for hidden financing of military reform at the expense of the internal reserves of the Army itself. Other such channels are the export of weapons in which, according to Western sources, China holds fifth place in the world (after the United States, the USSR, France, and Great Britain).

Of course, the concept of army reform would not be complete without taking the moral-political climate of the PLA into account. Now, the prestige of military service in China has dropped substantially, and an attitude has been formed among the people that the Army is a weapon of state coercion. The Army, whose true position was a forbidden subject for many years and which was to be praised in every possible way, appears in a negative light. The Chinese press has published a lot of revealing material which recounts phenomena that demoralize the Army, such as corruption, favoritism, roughness with subordinates, and others. "The military is losing the prestige it once enjoyed"—this is the point of view of many in the PRC mass media.

Northeast Asia

No Tae-u Proposals on 'Korean Community' Viewed

PM1310094789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Oct 89 First Edition p 3

[I. Melnik article: "Readiness for Dialogue! The South Korean President's New Proposals"]

[Text] ROK President No Tae-u delivered a speech at the National Assembly in which he expounded a new plan for restoring Korean national unity. The South Korean plan is founded on the concept of forming a "Korean community" as an intermediate stage toward the unification of North and South Korea into a "united democratic republic."

To expound this concept in brief, it essentially boils down, first, to the creation of a council involving the heads of the two Korean states, which is conceived as the supreme organ of the community, second, the formation of a council of ministers involving the northern and southern premiers and 10 ministers from each side, which will tackle the problem of reuniting 10 million relatives who were separated more than 40 years ago, and, third and last, the creation of another body—a council of representatives comprising 100 parliamentarians from North and South equally—whose tasks include preparing a draft constitution for a united Korea.

The South Korean president also called for the creation of a "peace zone" in the present demilitarized zone, where, according to No Tae-U, a secretariat and other "Korean community" bodies could be located.

One wonders: What prompted the publication of the program for resolving the Korean problem? For little more than 1 year ago the South Korean president "submitted" a "special declaration" in which he set out the main aims of Seoul's policy in respect of the DPRK. The rejection of confrontational policy and the development of broad dialogue between the two sides were the main components of last year's document. Admittedly, this declaration did not meet with particular enthusiasm in North Korea. People there still regard questions of military detente—a reduction in armed forces to 100,000 men on both sides, the withdrawal of U.S. armed forces and nuclear weapons from South Korea, the transformation of the entire Korean Peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, the signing of a declaration on nonaggression between Pyongyang and Seoul, and the creation of a confederation of North and South Korea—as being of paramount importance for solving the Korean problem. Incidentally, the DPRK literally a few day ago submitted another initiative, proposing to Seoul to hold a conference of representatives of the authorities, political parties, and public organizations from North and South in order to discuss means of restoring Korean national unity.

Thus, how are we to regard the current step by the Seoul administration on the Korean question? I believe that the idea of the "Korean community" is a response to the DPRK's major initiatives, which it has vigorously and consistently upheld over the last few years.

Of course, approaching the recent South Korean proposals objectively and impartially, we can see that a number of the ideas in it take Pyongyang's position into consideration and reflect a definite degree of constructivism. Take, for instance, the Seoul authorities' express readiness to conduct multifaceted dialogue with the DPRK, including talks on such an important problem as military detente. Official South Korean circles have even agreed to discuss the question of the U.S. military presence in the south of the peninsula.

Understandably, the presence of foreign troops—nuclear-capable troops, moreover—in South Korea destabilizes the situation on the peninsula and introduces additional difficulties and mistrust into already complex intra-Korean relations. The question of the U.S. military presence is becoming an increasing irritant for both the population of South Korea and for the U.S. public. Sentiments are becoming heightened in the U.S. Congress in favor of reducing the U.S. expeditionary corps. Senator D. Bumpers proposed withdrawing no less than 10,000 U.S. soldiers from the South over the next 3 years, while C. Levin, a prominent member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, called for a reduction in the troops of 33,000 men. Another senator, S. Nunn, submitted the idea of withdrawing all U.S. troops from South Korea over 5 years. The sentiments in Congress are understandable as the 43,000 U.S. soldiers and officers in the south of the Korean Peninsula cost the U.S. taxpayer $2.6 billion a year. Although the United States succeeded in "persuading" Seoul to increase its involvement in maintaining the expeditionary corps at the U.S.-South Korean "security" conference in Washington this July, that does not solve the problem.

Moreover, both Seoul and Washington have made frequent statements at government level about the "importance and need" to retain U.S. troops in the south of the Korean Peninsula. U.S. Vice President D. Quayle, who recently paid a visit to Seoul, assured the South Korean leadership that "the United States has no intention of withdrawing its troops from South Korea in the near future."

If that is the case, the following question inevitably arises: Why was it necessary for Seoul to discuss the question of U.S. troops in South Korea with Pyongyang? Is this a tactical ruse or a serious intention? One would nonetheless like to hope that No Tae-U's avowed new steps toward the DPRK do not represent mere declarations designed to mislead the international public but a readiness for serious dialogue with an equal partner.

Refusal To Compromise Mars Korean Unity Moves

PM1610142989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Oct 89 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent S. Tikhomirov dispatch: "Is a Bad Peace Better? The Latest Round of Talks Between North and South Korea Have Ended Without Result"]

[Text] Panmunjom-Pyongyang—...The handshake was clearly protracted but that was demanded by the correspondents, whose still and video cameras were "shooting" the two people frozen in awkward poses on both sides of the negotiating table....

Well, journalists' insistence is understandable. More than 7 months have elapsed since the last meeting between the DPRK and South Korean working groups to prepare North-South military-political summit negotiations. Unfortunately, the current round of talks did not produce any tangible results.

However, as they say, a bad peace is better than a good quarrel... On the other hand, you cannot escape the feeling that Pyongyang and Seoul are conducting talks just for the sake of it. I think that both sides are aware of this. That is why things are in effect getting no further than handshakes. This "marking time" can be explained by all manner of reasons. But, in my opinion, the main reason is as follows: The sides are not prepared to compromise. It sometimes seems that they are even speaking different languages, failing to understand one another and failing to hear their interlocutors.

Of course, 40 years of suspicion and mutual attacks are taking their toll. But, in my view, both Pyongyang and Seoul have good proposals, whose even partial implementation would facilitate real progress not only at the talks but would also help improve the political atmosphere on the peninsula.

Take, for instance, the DPRK's recent proposal to convene a conference on national reunification in the near future involving representatives of the North and South authorities, political parties, and organizations. DPRK Foreign Minister Kim Yong-nam said that the concept of confrontation and hostility must be abandoned and a new stance adopted based on a desire for genuine consolidation and reconciliation. That is a reasonable appeal, is it not? However, according to news agency reports, people in Seoul have simply paid no heed to it. Why? Because, you see, people there do not believe that the North is sincere. That is the long and the short of it. Incidentally, people in Pyongyang adopted the same position when the South Korean president set out a package of initiatives 1 month ago, which, according to the Seoul administration, point the way to the reunification of the divided nation.

But let us return to the DPRK's latest proposals, which, in my view, contain a most reasonable seed that could produce good shoots.

We think that our proposal to form a Democratic Confederative Republic of Korea, Kim Yong-nam pointed out, is the only means of unification. But, he added, we are ready to discuss any other proposal if it benefits unification.

One would have thought that this shows a sincere readiness to compromise. That is how Pyongyang's initiative reads. But as soon as the sides meet over the negotiating table, things go no further than discussion of procedural questions of little importance and mutual recriminations.

12 Oct Session of Inter-Korea Talks Analyzed

PM1710140589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent V. Lukashin: "DPRK-South Korea: The Difficult Path to Dialogue"]

[Text] On 12 October there was a meeting of representatives of the DPRK and South Korea on the preparation of military-political talks.

It is a 3-hour drive from Pyongyang to Panmunjom. The DPRK capital and the tiny settlement on the 38th parallel, where representatives of the North and South hold their meetings, are connected by a fast freeway. The highway ends at a barrier outside Panmunjom. Beyond it there are antitank ditches, piled-up chunks of granite, and tight coils of barbed wire. This is the border between the DPRK and South Korea. There are several blue huts in the joint security zone, where the military commission carries out its work. Beyond them is the continuation of the freeway. There is a sign that reads: "Seoul 70 km." There was a time when you would have been able to continue the journey. But it is not possible at the moment. In fact, that is why North-South talks have been going on for many years now in Panmunjom. No progress.

As is known, the first round of the meeting between representatives of the DPRK and South Korean governments, which took place at the beginning of the year and whose job was to prepare for high-level military-political talks, began badly. What kind of dialogue could there have been, indeed, amid the roar of U.S. tanks participating in the "Team Spirit-89" maneuvers?

At the second round in March there was no proper discussion either. The No Tae-u government decided to postpone all meetings indefinitely. The South explained its position as follows: Pyongyang is encouraging contacts with private individuals, while talks are the prerogative of the government...

The thing is that the millionaire Chon Chu Yen [name as published], honorary chairman of the Federation of Industrialists, visited the DPRK at the beginning of January, the religious figure Mun Ik Khvan [name as published] was there in March, and Seoul student Lim Su Gen went to the 13th World Youth and Students Festival. A cause for celebration, you might think. No Tae-u had his own opinion—he gave the millionaire a dressing down, put the pastor behind bars, and threatened the student with the ultimate penalty.

Suddenly there is an announcement from Seoul: Addressing a National Assembly session, No Tae-u called for a bilateral summit and the creation of a "council of heads of state," which would be the supreme leading organ of the "Korean community." The sincerity of this intention could only be tested in Panmunjom. The third round of the meeting of representatives of the DPRK and South Korean governments to prepare for high-level military-political talks was set for 12 October. There was a glimmer of hope: Suppose, this time, instead of mutual recriminations, the sides' representatives manage to find a common language and start to deal with the problem that has been preoccupying the people for ages!

On the morning of 12 October we crossed the invisible border between the DPRK and South Korea while marines cast curious glances at us. We went past the observation tower, built to look like an ancient pagoda, and entered the House of Peace. In the spacious hall there was an enormous table spread with a green tablecloth. Commentators and reporters from leading Seoul papers, radio, and television took up advantageous positions. What would the southerners bring with them to the meeting? What would happen in the third round?

The North's position was clear and concrete. The DPRK government put forward three main principles—solidarity, peaceful unification, and national consolidation. It was proposed that the Democratic Confederative Republic of Koryo should be created on this platform.

The DPRK delegation was headed by DPRK Administration Council adviser Pak Nam Dyun [name as published]. The guests were greeted by southern delegation head Son Khan Kho [name as published], deputy minister of national unification. The hosts and the guests shook hands and exchanged pleasantries. The DPRK delegation head made the first speech. He expounded the draft program for potential high-level military-political talks. The DPRK delegation proposed holding the first meeting in Pyongyang.

The discussion of procedural matters took a very long time. It was decided to hold another, fourth round to prepare for high-level talks on 15 November, because the Seoul delegation head again failed to put forward a single serious, worthwhile proposal.

...We returned to Pyongyang late at night. There were no cars on the road. But sooner or later this is bound to become the busiest of highways After all, it is only 270 kilometers from Pyongyang to Seoul.

Radio Urges Advertisement of ROK Products

SK1610130089 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 10 Oct 89

[Advertisement]

[Text] The Television and Radio Broadcasting Committee of Khabarovsk in the far eastern Soviet Union offers a wide range of possibilities for advertising the goods of South Korean companies in the far eastern Soviet Union and Siberia.

Through advertisement, the Television and Radio Broadcasting Committee can help South Korean businessmen find Soviet partners for cooperation in various economic and service fields.

The Television and Radio Broadcasting Committee can also help reporters and cameramen from South Korean television broadcasting companies gain news coverage or organize and film movies and television programs in the far eastern Soviet Union and Siberia.

The Television and Radio Broadcasting Committee of Khabarovsk can make catalogs, movies, videotapes, and video clips on the far eastern Soviet Union and Siberia, in compliance with the wishes of South Korean radio and television companies.

The Television and Radio Broadcasting Committee can convey news and information from Khabarovsk through the satellite communications system. In order for South Korea to be able to receive these materials, the Khabarovsk Radio Broadcasting Committee can (?develop) the receiving device, under certain conditions.

This request on the part of the Television and Radio Broadcasting Committee in the eastern Soviet Union and Siberia for advertisers can be considered a good thing, in that it creates conditions under which interested South Korean companies can advertise their goods to the Soviet people and enjoy closer economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. Such requests would also be helpful in acquiring (?knowledge) about the Soviet Union.

Proposals for advertisements for cooperation are asked to be forwarded to the following address:

The Khabarovsk Television and Radio Broadcasting Committee
680632, Khabarovsk, (Katarina) 80
Soviet Union

S. Korean Consumer Exhibition Opens in Moscow

LD1710131189 Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] An exhibition of South Korea's consumer goods has opened in Moscow with its leading companies displaying a variety of products from personal computers to toys and disposable syringes. The head of the South Korean trade representation in Moscow said many of his country's companies wanted to open business contacts and set up partnerships in the Soviet Union.

DPRK Army Minister Receives Admiral Sorokin

PM1610095789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Meeting Held"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 14 Oct—Korean People's Army Vice Marshal O Chin-u, member of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo Presidium and DPRK minister of the People's Armed Forces, today received Fleet Admiral A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, who is here on an official friendly visit.

Colonel General Yi Pong-won, deputy chief of the Korean People's Army Main Political Directorate, participated in the talks, which were held in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Mongolian Foreign Minister Stops Over 6-7 Oct

PM1110112189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] Mongolian Foreign Minister T. Gombosuren, who took part in the work of the 44th session of the UN General Assembly, was in Moscow 6-7 October en route home from New York. T. Gombusuren was seen off at the airport by B.N. Chaplin, USSR deputy foreign minister, and T. Gurbadam, Mongolian ambassador to the USSR.

Seen Off by CPSU's Girenko

PM1210134889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Stopover on the Way Home"]

[Text] J. Batmonh, general secretary of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and chairman of the Mongolian People's Republic People's Great Hural, who stopped over in Moscow on his way home from the GDR, left for Ulaanbaatar on 10 October.

The Mongolian guest was seen off at the airport by A.N. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials. Among the sendoff party was Ts. Gurbadam, Mongolian ambassador to the USSR.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Philippines 'Polarization' Over Marcos Viewed

HK1110052189 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 10 Oct 89

[Commentary by Vladimir Viktorov]

[Text] Where will be the final resting place of the former president of the Philippines, Ferdinand Marcos? The answer to this question, for many Filipinos, lies in a discussion involving humanitarianism.

The situation revolving around this issue is being used to fan the growing flames of political tension. The maneuverings and discussions in the name of the former leader of the country have brought about a polarization of various groups and sectors within society and politics in the Philippines. This is because there are still some people loyal to the former leader. They are, to this day, members of groups or blocs connected with the presidential palace in Manila. Some of these people plan to attend the funeral rites to be held abroad. It seems that these people now wish to forget all their past indiscretions which were committed and which succeeded in impoverishing the Filipinos masses.

The serious economic and political problems in the country have been exacerbated by this complicated situation. While the Philippines today seems engrossed in the death of its former leader, it appears oblivious to happenings overseas. It is known that Mr and Mrs Marcos, as well as their relatives, friends, and other acquaintances have all been living very well. By comparison, the standard of living in the Philippines has deteriorated alarmingly. The country's foreign debt has reached $38 billion.

According to reports in Philippine newspapers, the amounts treacherously taken out by the former president were deposited in countries interested in influencing Philippine foreign policy. This is but one opinion of many held by Filipinos who feel that their country has, unfortunately, had to play along with some countries, to the extent of being in the same position as Indochina, which was the victim of American aggression. This is also how Filipinos view the prospect of a long-term extension of the American military bases in the Philippines.

The result of the Marcos treachery was the uprising in 1986 when Mr and Mr Marcos had to flee to Hawaii, taking with them as much as $10 million from the national treasury. The Philippine Government has endeavored to retrieve these funds, with little success. The official investigation against Marcos instituted by Prosecutor General Francisco Chavez remains stymied, while charges of extortion, blackmailing, and various forms of corruption which are the cause of the impoverishment of many Filipinos remain untried.

On the matter of allowing Marcos to be buried in his country, there is apparently some support from the United States. The MANILA TIMES reports that Washington is playing its own game, similar to that involving Clark Air Field and Subic Bay, bases which play a big role in the Pentagon's Asian and Pacific strategies. However, there are Filipinos campaigning for peace and a growing number of people who want their voices to be heard on this matter. Whatever transpires, it is obvious that American strategists are playing a dangerous nuclear game, thus adding to the polarization of Filipinos. Such tactics go against the notion that people should be allowed to solve their own problems.

It is the Philippine Government's perogative to decide on a place where Marcos should be buried. It alone should decide on this. Latest reports indicate that whatever decision is reached, it will be in the interests of the entire Philippine nation.

Aquino Receives USSR Message of Condolences

PM1710123589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[USSR Council of Ministers message to C. Aquino]

[Text] To Her Excellency Corazon C. Aquino, president of the Philippines

We express sincere sympathy in connection with the natural disaster which has struck the Philippines, leading to loss of life and considerable material damage.

We ask you to convey our profound condolences to the friends and relations of the dead.
USSR Council of Ministers.

Near East & South Asia

Syrian Chief of Staff Begins Visit 16 Oct

Meets Yazov, Moiseyev

PM1810093989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Meeting at USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Text] Corps General Hikmat al-Shihabi, member of the Ba'th Party leadership and chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Syrian Arab Republic, arrived in the Soviet Union 16 October on an official visit at the invitation of Army General Mikhail Alekseyevich Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister.

The guest and the persons accompanying him were met at the airport by Army General M.A. Moiseyev and other generals and officers of the Soviet Armed forces. The welcoming party included 'Isam al-Na'ib, Syrian ambassador to the USSR, and Division General A.K. al-Muhammad, military attache at the Syrian Embassy in the USSR.

On the same day Army General Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, received Corps Gen H. al-Shihabi. Questions of mutual interest were discussed during the talks. Army General M.A. Moiseyev and 'I. al-Na'ib, Syrian ambassador to the USSR, participated in the talks.

Corps Gen H. al-Shihabi paid a call on Army General M.A. Moiseyev.

Army General M.A. Moiseyev gave a dinner in the Syrian guest's honor.

Tours Academy, Sees Akhromeyev

PM1810134389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Oct 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Official reports"]

[Text] On 17 October Corps General Hikmat al-Shihabi, member of the Ba'th Party leadership and chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Syrian Arab Republic, who is on an official visit to the Soviet Union, laid a wreath at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum. A wreath was also laid at the grave of the unknown warrior by the Kremlin wall.

Corps Gen H. al-Shihabi visited the K.Ye. Voroshilov Military Academy of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff. He familiarized himself with its class and laboratory base and with the organization of the teaching process and met with the academy's professorial and teaching staff and students. The Syrian guest was accompanied by Army General M. A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister.

On the same day Corps Gen H. al-Shihabi met with Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, adviser to the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman.

Baker Plan, Negotiations With PLO Assessed

LD1710183589 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Excerpts] The PLO Central Council meeting ended in Baghdad. The news from Baghdad is that the U.S. secretary of state's proposals, termed Baker's plan, was among the central issues discussed during the meeting.

We recall that this plan was aimed at arranging direct Palestinian-Israeli negotiations.

The inventor of this plan believes these direct negotiations should become an introduction for carrying out the elections in the occupied Arab territories.

We would like to point out that the idea of direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians is not an exciting surprise, because the Palestinians proposed this idea, and it was also reflected in the well-known Mubarak plan. However, the fact that the U.S. Administration has also proposed this idea is in itself marvelous, as it indicates that there are now elements of realism in Washington's Middle East policy.

However, the conditions of Baker's plan, that the Palestinian delegation should satisfy Israel's demands and that the negotiations should not contradict Israel's interests, indicate an unrealistic attitude, but indicate the customary support to Tel Aviv's political ambitions.

Naturally, the PLO leadership would react to this. The PLO reaction in the beginning was reflected in Yasir ‘Arafat's statements. Now this reaction is reflected in the resolutions of the PLO Central Council's Baghdad session. The Palestinian leadership rejected Baker's plan completely because it does not say anything whatsoever about the PLO. [passage omitted]

In Baghdad, it was pointed out anew that the PLO alone enjoys the right to speak for the Palestinian people, especially as it has taken a number of constructive steps toward peace. Israel did not take any constructive steps toward peace, however. Does the United States understand this? I think it understands this very well. That is why it carries out an attempt to match the Israeli interests with the realities of the matter.

Here is an example of these attempts. MENA reported from Washington that the U.S. Administration's representative has said that the U.S. Ambassador to Tunisia last Friday held talks with Hakam Bal‘awi, PLO representative there. They talked again about Baker's plan. The U.S. Administration's representative tried to convince the Palestinian side that the PLO should not obstruct an Israeli-Palestinian talk, which will be arranged according to the scenario drawn up by Washington and Tel Aviv, because, as he claimed, these talks would be an important step toward establishing peace in the Middle East. What does this reveal? This reveals that Washington understands that it is impossible to achieve realistic success in the Middle East settlement without the PLO. At the same time, Washington cannot abandon its pro-Israeli stance.

However, the U.S. Administration exerts huge efforts so that Baker's plan does not have the same fate as Shamir's plan. There are continuous consultations between Egypt and Israel. There is a search for methods which do not close the door to the negotiations and at the same time satisfy the Israeli Administration.

The solution to this is clear. Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze reminded Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Arens of the solution during their meeting in New York within the framework of the UN 44th General Assembly session. The solution: A fait accompli should be recognized. The fait accompli is that the PLO is considered as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Negotiations should be directed with the PLO representatives. In this case the settlement of the conflict in the Middle East will be achieved on the basis of balancing the interests, and will progress quickly toward satisfying all the countries and peoples of the Middle East.

Egypt's War Anniversary, Foreign Policy Noted

LD1310083689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2010 GMT 12 Oct 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valentin Dvinin]

[Excerpts] [Dvinin] When the topic of the Near East is raised, more often than not we confine ourselves to the situation in the Israeli-occupied areas on the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip. Today we can offer you a report from Egypt, a country that plays a role that is not the least important in the region.

[Correspondent K. Gerasimov, identified by caption, over video of military parade] October has a special place in the Egyptian political calendar. It is a month of celebrations to mark the events of 1973, to mark the October War—or the Ramadan War, as people here often frequently prefer to call it—since October then coincided with a holy month for all Muslims, the Ramadan fast. [passage omitted] As far as this year's celebrations are concerned, they were intended, among other things, to give a greater weight to the present Egyptian peace initiative, the proclaimed initial purpose of which is to set up a dialogue between the Palestinians and Israel.

One of the central events of the anniversary celebrations was the opening by President Mubarak of a military museum in Cairo containing a panorama of the battle for the Suez Canal. [passage omitted] On the evening that Mubarak was to view the panorama of the battle, in which he took part as commander of the Egyptian Air Force, it still seemed that the Israeli Cabinet might agree to the Egyptian plan. Alas, it was rejected. The only thing that the Israeli Government is prepared to agree to is consultations between Israel, Egypt, and the United States on the composition of the Palestinian delegation. Nevertheless, President Mubarak declared that Egypt will continue to strive for the organization of a a direct dialogue between the Palestinians and Israel. [Video shows tanks, armored vehicles, and troops on parade. Mubarak and dignitaries view panorama. Video cuts to show Mubarak being asked a question in English by unseen correspondent; Mubarak replies in English with superimposed Russian translation] A question to the president of Egypt:

[Gerasimov] How do you see the panorama? As a reminder of the heroism of the Egyptian people, the Egyptian soldier, or also as a warning of the danger of a new war in this area?

[Mubarak] Soviet television? I think you have much more experience than us in such matters. If we wish to commemorate the events of the October War and the liberation of our homeland it is not at all in order to warn anyone. It is just a question of our defense, and nothing else. [Video cuts to traffic on a bridge]

[Gerasimov] There is no doubt that president Mubarak's foreign policy—carefully planned, well-considered, and without any element of adventurism—has turned Egypt into an important factor for stability in the region.

Iranian Consumer Goods Exhibition Opens in Baku

PM1710135789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent A. Dzhalilov report: "Iranian Exhibition in Baku"]

[Text] Persian carpets and henna, oriental spices, elegant giant ventilators with dazzling chrome and plastic, footwear, video equipment, and textiles—that is by no means a full list of the goods that have adorned our country's first-ever exhibition of Iranian industrial and agricultural goods, which has opened in Baku.

The neighboring state's industry was represented by 160 private and state firms specializing in consumer goods production. Faultlessly made and designed and in no way inferior in terms of consumer and aesthetic characteristics to their best world counterparts, these goods could find a worthy place on our store shelves.

Indeed, this is the aim of the exhibition organized on the initiative of the Iranian Exports Development Center. This was stated at a meeting with journalists by Hasan Kameh-Kosh, Iranian deputy minister of commerce.

Nikitin Receives Mauritanian Fisheries Minister

PM1610115289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] On 13 October V.V. Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Mohammed Sidina Ould Sidya, minister of fisheries and maritime economy of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

During the meeting there was a constructive exchange of opinions on a wide range of questions of Soviet-Mauritanian cooperation in the fisheries sphere.

During the discussion of matters of interest to the sides, mutual satisfaction was expressed with the high level of relations between the two countries, based on the agreement between the governments of the USSR and Mauritania on cooperation in the sphere of maritime fishing, and the desire was expressed to continue to develop and strengthen this cooperation for the benefit of both countries and peoples.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Officials Tour Namibia, Preview Elections

MB1210184589 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Text] The Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee held a press conference on 10 October, on the occasion of the return from Namibia of the AAPSO [Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Committee] mission. The deputy general secretary of the AAPSO, (Chektor Basvos), spoke at the press conference on the results of the mission trip to Namibia.

He said: We have just returned from a tour of Namibia, during which we had an opportunity to scrutinize the situation before the next month's elections. This will be a great event in the history of the Namibian people. After meetings and talks with representatives of different political quarters, our mission has concluded that SWAPO [South-West African People's Organization] is the most authoritative political party in the country, and has the biggest chances for a victory. SWAPO symbolizes the hope of the Namibian people.

We have got the conviction that the major threat to the forthcoming elections lurks in the intimidation campaign waged by some political parties. First and foremost is the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance [DTA], that organizes provocations against SWAPO supporters with the tacit agreement of the South Africans authorities. The UNTAG [UN Transition Assistance Group] force is to play an important role in securing order at the elections.

Another problem hindering preparations for the elections is the absence of a law on elections. Less than a month is left before the election day, but the South African authorities have not yet made it public. A spokesman for the South African administration, though, assured us that would happen next week, when we talked to him.

Despite all the difficulties, we arrived at the conclusion that the elections would take place. However, it is necessary that the international community should keep control of the situation to successfully carry the elections through, and to further implement the Security Council Resolution 435.

Deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With the Asian and African Countries and permanent secretary of the AAPSO, (Vladimir Polikanov), spoke about the situation in the north of Namibia.

[Begin (Polikanov) recording in Russian fading into English translation] The situation in the north of the country remains very tense. This is caused by a number of factors. Firstly, the sharp rise in the activities of the DTA. Secondly, a consistent source of tension remain the former members of the Koevoet [police counterinsurgency unit] sub-units. As is known, it was formally disbanded, but as an organization it remains immune.

As said by UNTAG representatives, at any moment they could destabilize the situation. They are still under the control of the South African administration, and up to November they will be paid by it. This is what is causing alarm. Why just disarm the Koevoet, when it is necessary to completely break them up?

One should not forget about the UNITA [Union for the Total Independence of Angola] group, which according to the latest information, continues to cross over the Angola-Namibia border. The situation is very complicated, and we believe the nearer the elections, the more complex it could become.

Johannesburg Talks on Namibia, Angola Viewed

MB1710210889 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 16 Oct 89

[Igor Patovskiy commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] A 2-day extraordinary session of a three-sided commission for monitoring the settlement in South-West Africa got underway today. This time the representatives of Angola, Cuba, South Africa and observers from the Soviet Union and the United States are meeting in Johannesburg.

As you no doubt know, the business at hand concerns monitoring action on the agreements reached in December last year in New York. The first is on implementation of the Security Council Resolution 435 on granting independence to Namibia, and the second on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from the territory of Angola. From the formal viewpoint, those are two independent documents, but the problems of southwestern Africa are all tied up in a single knot.

The United States and South Africa, who insisted for a long time that those two problems be tackled together, still insist that an internal Angolan settlement is the key to stability in the region as a whole. It is by no mere chance, therefore, that the warning served recently by Angola's foreign minister—that ongoing American assistance to UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] may halt the withdrawal of Cuban troops—caused such an impact, specifically in the United States. The danger [words indistinct] when there is less than a month to go before elections in Namibia is quite imminent. Nevertheless, the United States intends to go on assisting Savimbi.

There are many problems, and at the session of the three-sided commission, there will no doubt be mutual satisfaction at the great many mutual rapproches. There is general concern over rising violence in Namibia. Whereas formerly the accusations were spearheaded mainly against the police, clashes between different parties are now becoming more and more frequent. That does not mean the police are beyond reproach.

In a recent report on Namibia, the United Nations secretary general, Perez de Cuellar, said that inspite of everything, members of the officially disbanded Koevoet [Police counterinsurgency Unit] punitive units still remain in the ranks of the police force. But no doubt the humanitarian issue, as it has been called by South Africa's foreign affairs minister, Roelof Botha, has recently developed into the greatest problem. Both Pretoria and the United States are seriously concerned by the fact of the prisoners in SWAPO [South-West Africa People's Organization] camps. An investigation mounted by a United Nations group has revealed that on every count the complaints launched against SWAPO are ungrounded. The fate of 350 people remains unknown, but that was enough for Roelof Botha to bring direct charges against SWAPO, and against the United Nations as well, ostensibly for covering up SWAPO.

The recent military anti-SWAPO campaign, while close to the surface, at present it is one of the few remaining ways of damaging the prestige of that organization, a means of keeping, it from getting the two-thirds of the votes in the elections, [words indistinct] independently draw up the country's constitution. But such an [words indistinct] of the situation at present, specifically at the session of the three-sided commission, need not be viewed in all black colors.

There [words indistinct] expected. They reflect very real and still unsolved problems. They are in keeping with [words indistinct] the elections. All the sides, including the observers, are too interested in their success, but they can [words indistinct] the results of the elections. Many observers believe that the so-called SWAPO prisoners affair, intended to damage SWAPO [word indistinct] image. Well, the less votes SWAPO gets, the greater the control South Africa hopes to retain on Namibia till in future it becomes independent. That is [words indistinct] session there will be at the three-sided commission at present prior to the election, and more complicated matters will be later, when contradictions in the Angolan/Namibian process will be relieved in their full volume.

East Europe

Gorbachev Interviewed in Berlin on GDR Ties

AU1810102989 Sofia POGLED in Bulgarian No 42, 16 Oct 89 pp 1, 6

[Interview with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, by "NOVOSTI correspondent," "especially for POGLED," in Berlin on 6 October: "Mikhail Gorbachev: We Have Much To Say to Each Other"]

[Text] [NOVOSTI] Today was a great day. What were its main elements? What are your strongest impressions?

[Gorbachev] I think that the GDR anniversary was the main thing. This is a great event in the life of the country and the people, with whom we are linked by decades of joint struggle and cooperation. I think that the GDR working people's holiday is also our holiday, as well as the holiday of every socialist country. It is a day of great content that gives us much to think about.

Nevertheless, the 40th GDR anniversary takes us back to the past, to that horrible and difficult war that was waged above all by our people, who did so much to destroy the horrible force called fascism, prevent the subjugation of our nations, and rescue others from occupation. As I said in Treptow Park, I cannot remain calm. Such moments are difficult for every Soviet man.

I told the German youth that my generation has a very important advantage: Because of our age we did not participate in the war. However, we saw it. I was in occupied territory. We witnessed the funerals and saw the difficult work and trials everywhere—in the rear and at the front. After the war we saw dozens of destroyed cities. The most developed part of our country was devastated. This allows us to compare the situation then and now. And I think this was the best and greatest that the postwar generations could do in the name of those who sacrificed their lives—to preserve peace, restore what had been destroyed, and open the road for us to move forward.

Yes, this movement, about which we justly speak so much today, has many problems. However, during the past years we have come along a very long road, and the people, who returned to peaceful labor, did much to restore the country. Today we could not make long-range plans for restructuring our country without everything that was done after the war by all the generations of Soviet people.

[NOVOSTI] This will probably be one of the themes of your talk with Erich Honecker?

[Gorbachev] Yes, I think that we have much to say to each other. Nevertheless, we shall devote more attention to the future, despite the fact that the present has also turned out to be a problem related to the profound transformations that are encompassing the entire world, including the socialist world.

Much ado is sometimes made about this. Some people are trying to belittle the importance of these transformations and the problems that we now have to solve. Yes, there are real difficulties in our country. We want to understand them, overcome them, and reach the broad road, without forgetting the main factors. We are heading along the correct road. What we have conceived corresponds to the interests of our nation, people, and the working people. It is the continuation of what we have done since the beginning in October 1917. Over the years I became convinced that while our people think about their future life and what new forms of life must be mastered, they are still inspired by the powerful stimuli of that October and the socialist ideals. This is the main factor. We shall find an answer to all the rest.

[NOVOSTI] Yes, obviously, it is necessary to look to the future. The theme of the common European home resounded in your speech....

[Gorbachev] If we consider the external aspect—our friends' holiday prompts us to do so—then I think that we, as well as all other nations, learned from our own sad experience that the cold war did not produce anything positive. Therefore, the recognition that another road is necessary grows so quickly not only among the scientific and intellectual circles, but also among the nations. Cooperation is necessary, as well as the recognition that problems cannot be resolved by force, but only through cooperation, the development of broad relations, and the exchange of opinions, while respecting the choice of every nation, of each of us.

I think that this has already been accepted in all continents, and especially in Europe. I think that the European nations will play an important role in the transition toward the peaceful period of developing our civilization, because many thing have begun here, in Europe, and because great experience and intellectual and scientific potential are concentrated here.

The transition from one stage or phase of development to another, including stages of human civilization, has never been an easy enterprise. Nevertheless, there is mutual understanding and international relations are being channeled along the line of firm cooperation in this area also. I am convinced of this.

SED's Hager Cited on 'Necessary Renovations'

PM1810123189 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 42, 15 Oct 89 p2

[Vladimir Markov dispatch under the rubric "From Our Correspondent": "The GDR: Four Decades of Socialism"]

[Text] Berlin—Hardly any other jubilee this year has received so much attention internationally as the October 7th 40-year jubilee of the GDR. The reasons for this are in the peculiarities of the GDR's past and present history.

Conceived as a pointedly antifascist state, the GDR has always visualized itself as the westernmost outpost of socialism in Europe. The Republic's existence has for decades been subject to question in the West, especially in the FRG. Certain circles in Bonn cannot take the sovereign existence of the GDR in stride even now.

However, this hasn't prevented the GDR from firmly establishing itself among the world's ten most advanced industrial nations as of the late 1960s.

Of course, the Republic has its problems, like any other country in the world. East Berlin has received large financial and workforce support, including construction teams from all of the GDR sometimes to the detriment of the development of other cities. The GDR's economists are concerned about the country's increasing foreign debt, increasing competition on the foreign market (half of the GDR's national income comes from exports) and a considerable volume of state subsidies.

However, they do not try to sweep these problems unde the carpet. In fact, they are openly discussed in order to find precise and effective solutions. The people of the GDR retain their businesslike approach to the present reality despite their jubilant and festive mood.

Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the Republic was also businesslike.

"What is most important for us," I was told by Professor Otto Reinhold, Rector of the Academy of Social Sciences under the aegis of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee, "is that Mikhail Gorbachev has confirmed the USSR's solidarity with the German socialist state and has rebuffed those in the West who would like to use current developments in the socialist countries for smuggling their former claims that the status quo in Europe be changed."

Professor Reinhold, a leading theoretician of the GDR, has his own explanation for the situation in his country. While Poland or Hungary can conduct radical reform and change their systems with the preservation of the Polish and Hungarian states guaranteed for good, any sharp changes of the political system of the GDR might jeopardize its existence as a state. This argument is getting ever more widespread in the GDR as of late. However, this argument is not undeniable, as I was told among East-Berlin's intellectuals. It reflects, I was told, an excessive "FRG fixation", as well as insufficient study of the question of what should the GDR's vision of itself be like in future.

After the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and all the full and candidate members to the Politburo of the SED, Kurt Hager, who is in charge of the ideology issues in the Politburo, told me that a clear concept for carrying out "necessary renovations" must be developed in the very near future. It would imply, first of all, "a more active involvement of the population in the solution of socially significant issues" and the improvement of the information policy of the GDR.

Signs of the new openness are gradually emerging in the GDR. A comparatively freer and interesting discussion is beginning in the press: a number of articles and reports published by newspapers contain critical assessments of the "insufficient tolerance" towards those whose opinions are at variance with the official viewpoint. There is also criticism of a "certain discrepancy between reality and its representation by the mass media".

In my opinion, the motives of those who were washed away by the wave of emigration now get a more differentiated treatment. Kurt Hager said that among those who had left the GDR there were people "at variance with socialism and who had wished to leave the Republic since long ago". Others have relatives in the FRG and are seeking a reunion. Still others are heading there because they cannot see the flip side of capitalism and are harbouring illusions about the life conditions in the West. In order to have the situation normalized, "the first thing to do is to remove everything which prevents people, especially young people, from developing their gifts," said Kurt Hager. Of course, and this is most important, it is necessary to learn how to keenly react to the currents of time and respond to the actual needs of the society and the moods of the people.

This is how the guidelines are being gradually developed which are leading the German Democratic Republic into its fifth decade.

GDR Bodies Actively Seeking Dialogue With Public

PM1710230989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch: "Dialogue With Public"]

[Text] Berlin—The 11 October Statement of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Politburo continues to be discussed throughout the republic. Meetings between party, government, and trade union leaders and labor collectives are under way. The meeting participants are noting that the statement has opened up new possibilities for the people of the republic to avail themselves even more fully of the advantages of socialism and to contribute by their labor and their creative initiatives to building the socialist future, GDR newspapers write.

In Berlin Guenter Schabowski, member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee and first secretary of the party's Berlin Bezirk Committee, met with the party aktiv at the capital's tele-electronics plant. The discussion which took place at the plant was open and sincere. G. Schabowski assured his audience that the party would do everything incumbent on it to give the statement specific, real content. This applies primarily to improving the quality of party leadership and conducting a dialogue in line with the GDR Constitution. The constructive dialogue will channel the renewal of socialism in a direction which, thanks to the development of democracy, will lead to its further strengthening.

The newspapers carry a report on a news conference held by Wolfgang Berghofer, chief mayor of Dresden, with representatives of the city public and of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Saxony and the Catholic Church. The sides agreed that the Statement of the SED Central Committee Politburo was a first step toward a broad dialogue which will lead to the solution of complex social problems. W. Berghofer stated that in the future citizens would be able to make wider use, within the framework of the Constitution, of the democratic potential of the city's assembly of deputies. He proposed that standing and temporary working groups be set up which, with the help of specialists, could discuss specific "burning" problems. The city assembly is to adopt a decision on such groups as early as next week.

The topics for discussion put forward by the public included citizens' rights and security, information policy, civic responsibility, social concepts of socialism in the GDR, trips abroad and the posibility of resettlement, education and culture, social development in Dresden, and also ecological and economic problems and problems concerning trade and supplies for the population. Both sides came to the conclusion that the dialogue which has been initiated must be continued.

Meanwhile the press reports that in Leipzig, after public prayers for peace in five churches, the congregations held a demonstration which was joined by inhabitants of the city and the surrounding area. Tens of thousands of people took part in the demonstration. Thanks to the level-headedness of the law-enforcement forces and the demonstration participants there were no incidents in the city.

Hungary Continues Debate on Future of MSZMP

PM1710231789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent F. Lukyanov dispatch: "MSZMP To Continue Its Activities?"]

[Text] Budapest—A whole week has passed since the extraordinary congress of the MSZMP—which became the constituent congress of the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP]—ended, yet a lively debate continues in the country not just about the future of the new Socialist Party but also about the future of the former MSZMP...

As reported by IZVESTIYA earlier, the decision to establish the new party was adopted by an overwhelming majority of congress delegates' votes. However, at the same time 159 delegates, including K. Grosz, general secretary of the MSZMP, voted against this decision, while 38 delegates abstained. A number of platforms operating within the MSZMP took up a negative stance toward the establishment of the MSZP. They include the "Marxist Unity" Platform and the Ferenc Muennich Society, in connection with which the epithets "orthodox" and "fundamentalist" are used more often than not.

During the days which have elapsed since the congress, representatives of these platforms and also of the "Association for Socialism" movement which has joined them, have been heard holding forth more than once about the possibility of establishing a new party or preserving the MSZMP. The point is that when the question of the establishment of the Hungarian Socialist Party in place of the MSZMP was being decided at the congress, it was declared that in legal terms the MSZP would be the heir and successor of the former party, but no formal decision on disbanding the MSZMP, or ending its activities, was adopted.

On Monday a meeting of MSZMP members was held in the building of the party district committee in the Budapest working class district of Angyalfoeld, attended by around 1,000 people mainly of retirement age. The meeting was addressed by R. Ribanszky, the leader of the "Marxist Unity" Plaform, who, applauded by those present, expressed disagreement with the congress decision to establish a new party, which, according to his words, the delegates were not empowered to do, and declared that the MSZMP will continue its work. He announced that the "Marxist Unity" Platform which he is heading was disbanding in favor of a renewed MSZMP.

In this context R. Ribanszky stated that the next, 14th MSZMP Congress (the congress which has just ended was not given an ordinal number) would be held before the end of 1989. The meeting adopted an appeal "To All Members of the MSZMP Loyal to Marxist-Leninist Ideas" urging them to remain in the MSZMP's ranks.

Dissociating themselves from the mistakes of the past, from the legacy of Stalinism, and also from bourgeois liberalism, those present expressed support for the MSZMP's course toward radical renewal and democratization inside the party, transition to a multiparty system and a market economy comprising various forms of ownership, including private ownership, and the establishment of a rule-of-law state. However, despite all this they came out against the agreements reached at the nationwide "roundtable." In the sphere of foreign policy the renewed MSZMP should, according to the opinion of those present in the hall, strive for improved mutual relations with neighboring countries and a reform of alliance ties within the Warsaw Pact system, closely combining this process with "entry" into Europe.

The meeting expressed virtually unanimous support for a proposal nominating K. Grosz—who, as is known, has refused to join the MSZP—as the leader of the renewed MSZMP. According to R. Ribanszky, preliminary talks on this account, which have not been entirely fruitless, have already been held with K. Grosz. As regards mutual relations with the MSZP, the meeting proposed that the property of the former MSZMP be divided proportionately between the two parties (that is, the new MSZP and the renewed MSZMP) according to the number of their future members.

The next few weeks will show with what response the Angyalfoeld initiative will meet and what effect it will have on the extraordinarily complex political situation in the country.

Aboimov Consults With Hungary's Nemeth, Horn

LD1710212489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2017 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Budapest, 17 Oct (TASS)—In Budapest on 16-17 October of this year, consultations took place between I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs of the Hungarian Peoples Republic [HPR]. In the course of the conversation an exchange of opinions was carried out on questions of the development of Soviet-Hungarian relations and on the interaction of both countries in the international arena, including within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty. I.P. Aboimov was received by M. Nemeth, Premier of the HPR Council of Ministers and by G. Horn, HPR minister of foreign affairs.

PRAVDA Profiles Hungarian Socialists' Nyers

PM1710133189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov dispatch under the general heading "Dialogue": "Rezso Nyers—President of the Hungarian Socialist Party"]

[Text] "I would like to know some details about the newly elected president of the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP]." A. Ivanov (From a telephone call to PRAVDA).

A large photograph on the front page of NEPSZABADSAG shows Rezso Nyers, leaning forward in his chair, listenings pensively to advice, proposals, or opinions from two delegates at the congress. One of them is even squatting down. It was noted that during the MSZP congress which has just been concluded, important questions were being approved in the intervals in the lobbies and corridors, and at meetings held by representatives of the platforms. At the same time, as the deputies said, Rezso Nyers played an integrating, "linking" role. Indeed, he himself admitted this to us journalists at the press conference.

For the first time, delegates at the congress gave a show of strength to the apparatus, the government newspaper MAGYAR HIRLAP noted, and the former and current president of the party held the key to the work of the forum from beginning to end. Rezso Nyers' whole previous career bears witness to the fact that he knew what he wanted.

"As a reformer, I am like a long-distance runner, and I was frequently overtaken in short distances," R. Nyers said at the congress, to approving laughter from the hall.

There were no alternative nominations at the congress in the elections for the president of the new party, the Hungarian Socialist Party, which replaces the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP]. R. Nyers received 86 percent of the votes.

I met R. Nyers for the first time in the late 1960's. Hungarian economic reform was gaining momentum, and he was its main inspirer and initiator. The name of R. Nyers became well known during this period. He wrote several books and pamphlets.

A few biographical details. As a printing worker, he joined the Hungarian Social Democratic Party in 1940. After the war, he was one of the leaders of nationalized trade, chairman of the Hungarian Consumer Cooperative Union, and Hungarian finance minister. From 1966 to 1975, he was a Politburo member and MSZMP Central Committee secretary. But in 1974-1975, reforms and transformations started being abandoned. In the document adopted at this congress by the MSZP on the lessons learned on the road that Hungary has traveled since 1945, it is noted that putting the brakes on the reform process preserved the existing economic structure and hindered technical development. R. Nyers was removed from the Politburo and the Central Committee secretariat. He was appointed director of the Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics and then merely a consultant there.

Even before the war in Hungary, there was an organization for the progressive intelligentsia—the March Front (named in honor of March 1848, when the bourgeois-democratic revolution started), which was supported by the communists. Two years ago, R. Nyers and a number of other politicians formed the New March Front (R. Nyers was even reprimanded by the Central Committee for this). Today the Front is continuing to be the active force of renewal in the country. Many famous economists, sociologists, political scientists, and writers belong to this social movement. At the party conference in May 1988, R. Nyers was again elected member of the Central Committee Politburo, and in July of that year, the MSZMP president. And now it is the congress.

The MSZP president is faced with great organizational work to unite the former MSZMP members (and this is no easy task) in the next few weeks, and win the trust of the masses in the new party of reform.

R. Nyers is the most highly experienced member of the MSZP Presidium which was elected at the congress—he was born in 1923.

Polish Price Rises, Hungarian Front Forum Noted

PM1710153189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS reports from Poland and Hungary prefaced by introductory paragraph]

[Text] The attention of many people is currently riveted on the development of events in Poland and Hungary. As a rule, reports from these countries amaze us, even shock us. The democratization process in these countries is far from straightforward and sometimes gives rise to negative phenomena, particularly in the economy. This is shown by these two telegrams received yesterday from TASS.

Rising Prices

Since yesterday bread prices have risen by 20-30 percent in the Polish capital. The reason for the rising price of bread products is that enterprises in the flour milling industry are raising the price of flour.

At the same time, the price of Polish cigarettes is to rise by 65 percent and the price of imported cigarettes by 70 percent. PAP has said in this connection that manufacturers are being forced to raise their prices as a result of the rising cost of raw materials.

Quoting trade organizations, the Polish press has also carried information on sharp rises in the cost of cars. Passenger vehicles made in Poland and the Soviet Union will be more expensive, as will vehicles made in Czechoslovakia and the GDR. The Soviet "Volga" and "Niva" cars will be the most expensive of those manufactured in socialist countries.

Congress Ends

The Ninth Hungarian Patriotic People's Front Congress has finished work in Budapest. Its delegates discussed and adopted decisions on the most topical questions of the front's activity in present-day conditions.

The congress adopted a resolution in support of the proposal to make 23 October—the day of the start of the Hungarian events in 1956—a national holiday.

The forum delegates were addressed by M. Nemeth, member of the Hungarian Socialist Party Presidium and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers. He pointed to the need to create a national center enjoying the broad support of the popular masses and indicated that an important role in its formation could be played by organizations such as the Patriotic People's Front.

Mazowiecki Discusses Economic Policy Guidelines

90UI0017A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 7 Oct 89 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Speech of T. Mazowiecki"]

[Text] Warsaw, 6 Oct (TASS)—In Warsaw Thursday [5 October], under the chairmanship of the head of the Polish Government T. Mazowiecki, a meeting of the Polish Council of Ministers was held at which they considered the preliminary draft of the basic directions of the cabinet's economic policy. We are aware of the economic difficulties that have befallen on each person in Poland, we see the waiting lines, the shortages of goods, and the constantly growing prices which are causing uneasiness in the society, T. Mazowiecki said.

We have a choice of only two possibilities: either the difficult, complicated path to a market economy and economic mechanisms that have already been tested in the world or departure, a return to the past, to the directive-distributional national economy which can sometimes hold back price increase but does not open up prospects for emerging from the crisis. While we are aware of our difficulties, we are interested in gradually getting onto the straight road.

Government plans will be neither perfect nor easy but we are speaking about having things get better in a year and counteracting the hyper-inflation at the present time, and then beginning a basic fight against inflation. The head of state noted the need to put a program of social protection of the population in place.

Implementation of the cabinet's economic program will be difficult but it will make it possible to improve the situation and to overcome the negative phenomena not immediately but gradually. Within 1 year it is intended to provide for improvement of the situation and in the next few years to bring the country's economy onto the path of development.

This difficult program in combination with possible foreign aid will be realistic if during this time, on the basis of mutual understanding with the society, we manage to overcome the feeling of hopelessness, T. Mazowiecki said.

The government has authorized the deputy chairman of the Polish Peoples Republic Council of Ministers L. Balcerowicz to submit the cabinet's draft economic program to the society.

Mazowiecki's USSR Visit 'Still Being Discussed'

LD1810091189 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 0430 GMT 18 Oct 89

[Text] At a Moscow Press Conference Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov, when asked about Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki's visit to the USSR, answered that the matter is now being discussed and that it is still being discussed in Warsaw.

'Free Market Prices' Spur Polish Inflation

90UI0031A Moscow TRUD in Russian 10 Oct 89 p 3

[Article by TRUD staff correspondent Yu. Skvortsov: "Difficult Daily Round"; datelined "Warsaw, October"]

[Text] I did not recognize the city when I came back to Warsaw after taking leave. I arrived on a business day, but hardly any moving cars could be seen in the street. Later I understood what was happening from conversations. An acquaintance of mine said: "I have not been driving my car for a month now. The new price for gasoline is beyond my means."

Let us leave the motorists alone. It was in grocery stores that, as they say, my jaw really dropped. I had to pay 260 zlotys for a loaf of white bread which as recently as August cost 70 zlotys. The price for a package of butter jumped from 270 zlotys to 1,500. Potatoes, for a long time now the main food product for many Poles, has become three times more expensive. The price for a delicacy such as ham has increased 10-fold, from 1,500 to 15,000 zlotys per kilogram.

The average salary in Poland at present is 240,000 zlotys, and the average retirement benefit is 60,000. A fashionable sweater for ladies costs 400,000, and the most unpretentious shoes 60,000. School lunches for a child cost 30,000 zlotys. What if you have two or three children rather than one? Hustle as best you can. The future holds no special promise: According to official forecasts, prices may soar yet again by a factor of 3 to 4 before the end of the year.

What has happened? Let us recall that recently the foodstuffs sector in Poland switched to free market prices. The objective of this was good: Give an incentive to the peasants to produce main food staples more vigorously. However, the increase in meat prices pulled up the prices for literally everything, beginning with soap and through jewelry.

However, inflation in Poland is nothing new. For a long time, its cycles were accompanied by outbreaks of strikes. At present, social conflicts are not in evidence. Could it be that many Poles have come to believe in the ability of the new government to extricate the country from an economic catastrophe? After all, the leaders of Solidarity under whose colors the government was largely formed have long promised the Poles prosperity if they come to power.

Finally, hopes of obtaining Western aid have appeared. The first gifts from Western Europe are already appearing in Poland—free grain, meat, and other foodstuffs. To be sure, they are free only for the new Polish Government because in the stores they do not give them away but rather sell them, and at the highest prices at that.

Western businessmen have begun arriving in this country. However, I would be straying from the truth if I were to state that these facts make all Poles equally enthusiastic. Even now, these voices can be heard: "Could Poland end up being bought up with dollars?", "Will the country lose first economic and then political sovereignty?"... But who is in a position to respond to these questions now?

The opinion is also common that the West "thus far is not justifying all the hopes attached to it." Poland needs at a minimum $10 billion, and right away, "on the barrel," whereas potential creditors quote a far smaller number...

Of course, the main hope is for profound economic reforms in the country. The economic program of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Poland has not been announced yet. However, in general it is clear from the speeches of cabinet members on TV and in the press that the government intends to destroy the planned economy in the country and restructure it along free-market lines. That is, the methods and forms of capitalist economic operations will be the model.

A law on property is being developed which, as expected, will initiate the process of denationalization of many plants and factories, their transition from the control of the state to private hands or to collective ownership. The government will not interfere in price setting through administrative means. Demand and supply, expenditures and revenues will have to somehow reconcile among themselves, this time in keeping with the laws of the market. The problem is whether they will reconcile...

No secret is made of the fact that the period of breaking down present-day economic structures and creating new ones will turn out to be painful. The financial bankruptcy of some industrial enterprises, as well as collective and state farms, is in the cards. Unemployment is inevitable; its extent is simply unknown at present. Why then do many Poles look forward with hope to a reform that severe? They reason more or less like this: After all, it has ensured a high standard of living for the people in Western countries!

However, in the newspapers the following question is also voiced: Why exactly should the capitalist economy be the model for Poland? As is known, Western prosperity does not apply to everyone. The unemployed, even if they own cars, can hardly be called happy people. Why then does Poland have to borrow everything from the West, including its flaws? Is it not more correct to find its own path, a more humane one, all the more so because thus far there have been no guarantees that repatterning a planned economy into a market one is at all possible without catastrophic consequences...

Not only informal groups, but also the PZPR [Polish United Workers Party] organizations, leaders of the OPZZ [National Trade Union Confederation], and even some trade union activists of Solidarity are stating openly their negative attitude toward the eventual social consequences of transforming the Polish economy on the basis of Western blueprints.

Therefore, the quiet in Poland at present is only superficial. Actually, people's opinions and passions are raging...

Soviet-Polish Friendship Society Secretaries Meet

*PM1710133389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4*

[TASS correspondent Yu. Sidorov report: "Meeting of Friends"]

[Text] Smolensk, 15 Oct—A meeting of department secretaries from Soviet-Polish and Polish-Soviet Friendship Societies in union republics, oblasts, and voivodships has ended. For 3 days its participants discussed questions of the further development and strengthening of the traditional relations of friendship and brotherhood between the two neighboring peoples. A feature of the meeting was, in the words of its participants, the realistic nature of the proposals and its creatively intensive atmosphere.

Lushev Attends Fete for Polish Army Anniversary

PM1710105789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Reception at Polish Embassy"]

[Text] Brigade General A. Czernow, army, navy, and air force attache at the Polish Embassy in the USSR, held a reception 11 October to mark the 46th anniversary of the Polish Army. The reception was attended by Army General P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, and other officials.

J. Smolinski, Polish temporary charge d'affaires to the USSR, was present.

PRAVDA Rounds Up Zaykov Visit to CSSR

PM1710133589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 17 Oct 89 p 4

[TASS report: "Cordial Reception"]

[Text] M. Jakes, General Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee, today received L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow City CPSU Committee, who is on a working visit here.

During a conversation which took place in an atmosphere of the friendship, mutual understanding, cordiality, and frankness which are typical of relations between the two parties, the unity of the CPSU and CPCZ, and the community of aims and tasks were reaffirmed.

It was stressed that the restructuring in the Soviet Union and the qualitative transformations in the life of Czechoslovakia are directed at the improvement of socialism and at increasingly full satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of both peoples. The new tasks require an increase in the practical orientation of Soviet-Czechoslovak ties. The forthcoming Days of Moscow in Prague will be an important step in the strengthening of friendship and cooperation.

M. Stepan, member of the presidium of the CPCZ Central Committee and first secretary of the Prague City CPCZ Committee, and V.P. Lomakin, USSR ambassador to the CSSR, took part in the meeting.

The Moscow delegation laid a wreath at the tombstone of K. Gottwald. The red ribbon bears the inscription: "To Klement Gottwald—Eminent Son of the Czechoslovak people, Prominent Figure of the International Communist and Workers' Movement".

A friendly conversation took place at the Prague City CPCZ Committee between L. N. Zaykov and M. Stepan. Prague Mayor Z. Horcik, and members of the Bureau of the Prague City CPCZ Committee also took part.

It was noted during the conversation that the policy of renewal is directed at fuller revelation of the possibilities of socialism, at a turn toward the needs of people, and at solving large-scale socio-economic tasks. The difficult restructuring tasks can be resolved more easily by combined efforts. Proceeding in common ranks, fraternal countries win time. The Moscow delegation familiarized itself with the experience of organization of food supplies in the Czechoslovak capital, and visited the "Laktos" dairy enterprise and a small bakery, of which dozens are being formed now in Prague.

A colorful opening ceremoy of the Moscow Days in Prague was held in the National Theater, which was attended by M. Jakes and other party and state leaders of the republic.

Opening the Moscow Days, L. N. Zaykov thanked the people of Prague on behalf of the Soviet guests for the warm reception. Our meetings, he stressed, are always a significant event in Soviet-Czechoslovak relations and a convincing demonstration of the indissoluble friendship between the two fraternal peoples. And today, too, we meet as good and old friends.

The diverse links between party, local soviet, trades union and youth organizations and labor collectives of Moscow and Prague organically intertwine into the living fabric of the dynamic and steadily developing relations between the USSR and the CSSR, the cementing foundation of which is the indissoluble alliance of the CPSU and the CPCZ. Considerable positive potential for cooperation in virtually all spheres of life has been accumulated in recent years. Contacts between party and public organizations and between twinned rayons have become stronger and more businesslike. Over 50 industrial enterprises and scientific collectives have organized direct ties. Joint enterprises are being set up. Ideological cooperation is being strengthened and cultural exchange is being intensified.

The first secretary of the Moscow City CPSU Committee wished the Prague Party organisation success, wished all the people of Prague happiness and prosperity, and proposed a toast in honor of the indestructible friendship between the peoples of the USSR and the CSSR and between communists and the working people of Moscow and Prague.

M. Stepan welcomed those present. The Moscow Days in Prague, he said, are taking place at a turning point. We attach exceptional importance to them. The all-round process of social restructuring and democratization is having a profound influence on the life of Prague and Czechoslovakia as a whole. Changes are taking place in the USSR and the other socialist countries. We have one aim—to raise society to a qualitatively higher level of development. We are certain that during the present Moscow Days the desire for mutual understanding will prevail.

The evening ended with a festive gala concert with the participation of leading performers and artistes from Moscow.

Zaykov Ends Visit, Departs

LD1710213289 Moscow TASS in English 2111 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Prague October 17 TASS—Lev Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow Party committee, left Prague for Moscow today.

He was leading a Moscow delegation on a three-day visit to the Days-of-Moscow-in-Prague festival.

During the visit, delegation members had numerous meetings and talks with Prague citizens, leaders of the district and city party organizations and General Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Milos Jakes.

Komi ASSR Chairman Received in Bulgaria

LD1710084189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1928 GMT 16 Oct 89

[Text] Sofia, 16 Oct (TASS)—There was a meeting here on Monday between Georgi Atanasov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, and Vyacheslav Khudyayev, chairman of the Komi ASSR Council of Ministers.

During the conversation which took place, the sides discussed ways of broadening the cooperation between the two republics in the economic sphere. It was noted that interaction in the sphere of timber-processing and pulp-processing plays an important role in the development of the economies of the two republics.

Particular attention was devoted to increasing the efficiency of interaction on the basis of comprehensive processing of raw materials, the creation of joint production capacities, and the establishment of direct production and scientific-technical contacts.

West Europe

SPD's Brandt Winds Up Visit to Moscow

On Cooperation With Perestroyka

LD1710181389 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—"It was a good, meaningful visit," Willy Brandt told reporters here today.

The president of the Socialist International and honorary chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany has spent several days in the Soviet capital where he met and had talks with many people.

Today Brandt met Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

"We were given a lot of information about perestroyka in the Soviet Union," Brandt noted.

Brandt said that when questioned about the attitude Gorbachev expected from Western leaders towards perestroyka, the Soviet leader said: "I am expecting understanding".

Brandt said that an agreement had been reached about a visit to Moscow by a Socialist International delegation in the first half of 1990. The aim of the visit is to identify areas of mutual interest, compare points of view and map out ways of cooperation.

During the talk, Brandt continued, we exchanged opinions about regional conflicts and possible joint actions aimed at settling them. Issues of the world economy, European security and cooperation also came under discussion.

Speaking about the Western reaction to Soviet perestroyka, the Socialist International chairman said he was for the "maximum of cooperation".

Perestroyka is of interest not only to Soviet people, but also to Europe and the world community as a whole. This process should be helped as much as possible.

More on News Conference

LD1710231589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A press conference by Willy Brandt for Soviet and foreign journalists took place in the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs today.

Willy Brandt spoke about the results of his visit to our country. He spoke in detail on today's meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Having touched upon a number of international problems, in particular the holding of the Vienna disarmament talks, he stressed the importance of their positive solution. This will make it possible for the West to expand contacts with the Soviet side in various spheres and to raise their quality. Willy Brandt noted the necessity to strengthen all-European cooperation, especially taking into account the establishment of a single market of the EEC member countries, and the transformations which are taking place in socialist countries. The guest stated that opportunities exist for strengthening contacts along the line of the Socialist International.

Willy Brandt then answered numerous correspondents' questions. [video shows newsmen asking questions]

After the press conference Willy Brandt granted an interview to Soviet television. [video shows Brandt and Aleksandr Zholkver seated in chairs]

[Begin Brandt recording in German with superimposed Russian translation] The meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev was the most important moment of my present trip to Moscow. Bearing in mind the nature of the questions which were discussed, it is of special significance. For me, personally, this meeting was in many respects instructive. It made it possible to become more familiar with the present stage of development in the Soviet Union. At the same time, this meeting provided an opportunity to exchange views on what we can do to develop relations between our parties and between the CPSU and the Socialist International. [end recording]

Continuing to speak about the present stage of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, Brandt noted in particular that the conviction and the confidence of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in the conception of perestroyka and along with this the measures undertaken by him on developing this conception made a great impression on him. For example, a new legislation on ownership is now being discussed in detail in the Soviet Union. The new principles of tackling nationality problems in the USSR are very interesting, too, although this is of course not a simple process. I think, stressed Brandt, that the West should not attempt to exploit the complexities of this process in order to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union in a spirit of cold war. On the contrary, we should give our support to the process of perestroyka, in particular by widening economic, scientific, and technical cooperation.

17 Oct Departure

LD1710191689 Moscow TASS in English 1908 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—Willy Brandt, president of the Socialist International and honorary chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, left Moscow today.

He was in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

In the airport, Brandt was seen off by Valentin Falin, member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and head of the party's international department, and high-ranking party Central Committee officials.

The send-off party also included the West German ambassador to the USSR, Klaus Blech.

Admiral's Reticence on FRG Warship Visit Hit

PM1810105389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov dispatch: "Meeting With Admirals"]

[Text] Leningrad, 14 Oct—The Kronshtadt Fortress greeted a detachment of warships carrying the FRG flag, proceeding past its walls on an official friendly visit, with a National Salute.

The destroyer Rommel, the helicopter carrier frigate Niedersachsen, and the cargo ship Coburg lowered their anchors for 3 days in the harbor on the Neva. Almost 900 crew members and a large group of West German journalists reporting on the visit started familiarizing themselves with the city as soon as they stepped on shore. Museums and theaters prepared to welcome them hospitably. Official visits were made. On board the ships, sailors from the FRG showed the citizens the conditions of service. They found the meetings with Baltic sailors interesting, and football and volleyball matches were arranged.

"Our sailors were delighted about the visit to Leningrad," Admiral H.R. Bremer said at a press conference organized for Soviet and West German journalists, "because that they could begin good-neighborly contacts and cooperation at sea.

"Such a visit is the first in the history of relations between our countries. In the FRG it is given particular significance. Our visit to Leningrad, which is intended to promote the strengthening of trust and cooperation, was made possible by the changes taking place in the Soviet land."

Answering correspondents, H.R. Bremer said that building bridges of trust is not at all easy, but it must be attempted. And, it seems, it was not by chance that the thought expressed by G. Lichtenburg, the German scholar and publicist, was quoted at the press conference—let things first change so that later they can improve.

Indeed, building bridges of trust between servicemen is probably more complex than doing so in other spheres even today. However, you cannot ignore the fact that public opinion, which is formed by the mass media, plays a by no means unimportant role even here.

It is therefore distressing that it was not considered possible to send a sufficiently competent spokesman who was prepared to speak to the correspondents. Rear Admiral K.L. Tulin countered completely innocent questions, which had nothing to do with military secrets or defense might, in a stereotyped way: He said that he was not authorized to give interviews to the press.

There was no point in West German and Soviet correspondents asking questions of the rear admiral, since the naval commander, when asked about his attitude to arms reduction and disarmament problems, clearly uttered the prepared answer: I fully approve of the Soviet Government's policy, but I am not authorized to give any interviews.

After such a reiteration, those present just shrugged their shoulders in bewilderment. We can only hope that they excuse some of our military chiefs' ignorance of of how to deal with press spokesmen and that they do not spread the opinion on the pages of foreign publications that apparently a Soviet rear admiral needs some kind of special authority to express his stance as a citizen—for which, incidentally, a midshipman did not need permission either before, or still less now.

Wallenberg Group Says Document 'Shed No New Light'

LD1710101689 Moscow TASS in English 0900 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—By TASS correspondents Nikolay Vukolov and Igor Peskov:

"Our first meetings and talks in Moscow were friendly, "Per Anger, chairman of the Swedish "Raoul Wallenberg Society" said at a press conference in the Swedish Embassy here on Monday [16 October].

During the war Per Anger was assigned to the Swedish Mission in Budapest and knew Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish diplomat arrested by Soviet military authorities in the Hungarian capital in 1945.

Anger came to Moscow together with Raoul Wallenberg's stepsister and brother—Nina Lagergren and Buy von Dardel—to meet representatives of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, KGB and other organisations. They were accompanied by the society's secretary Sonia Sonnenfeldt.

The Swedish delegation was received on the very first day of its stay in Moscow by Valentin Nikiforov, Soviet deputy foreign minister, and Vladimir Pirozhkov, deputy chairman of the State Security Committee (KGB).

In the course of these meetings new light was shed on the "Raoul Wallenberg case," as it is called in Sweden. The relatives were given documents and Wallenberg's personal belongings, his notebooks and diplomatic passport. According to Anger, Wallenbergs, passport is authentic. He himself had prolonged it when attached to the Swedish Mission in Budapest.

Nevertheless, the society's representatives and Wallenberg's relatives stressed that the copy of the paper issued by A. Smoltsov, chief of the Lubyanka Jail Sanitary Department certifying the Swedish Diplomat's death in July 1947, which was handed over to them on October 16, "shed no new light on the case." This document, they said, repeats word by word the memorandum of 1957 handed to the Swedish ambassador in the USSR by Andrey Gromyko, who was then Soviet deputy foreign minister.

Wallenberg's relatives reiterated their view that Raoul Wallenberg was alive then or died much later than officially claimed. They argue that there were inmates of Soviet jails who saw Wallenberg after his official date of death. They pointed out that therefore they could not be absolutely sure that the Soviet version of Wallenberg's death, supposedly from a heart attack, was true.

Soviet and Foreign pressmen asked what proof was needed to convince the relatives of Wallenberg's death. But they did not get an exhaustive answer from the relatives or from members of the "Wallenberg Society."

On the same day Nikolay Uspenskiy, chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Second European Department, made a statement at the ministry's press centre. "The noble activities of Raoul Wallenberg are highly appreciated in the USSR," he said, "and it is important to clarify this question to the end, since "it disturbs the general public in many countries, including the Soviet Union."

The Soviet side has no information on the whereabouts of Raoul Wallenberg's remains. "The only fact we rely on," the Foreign Ministry spokesman said, "indicates that there is practically no hope that Wallenberg is still alive or was alive after 1947. His death has been established by the document handed over to his relatives." Moreover, A. Smoltsov, chief of the Lubyanka Jail Sanitary Department, died in May 1953 and therefore "we can ask him nothing now."

Olivetti's Alleged Violation of COCOM Noted

PM1710132889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent N. Miroshnik: "COCOM Again..."]

[Text] Rome, 14 Oct—The Italian newspapers have reported that on 22 September P. Secchia, U.S. ambassador to Rome, handed the Italian Foreign Ministry a protest over the violation "by several Italian firms" of the rules and recommendations of the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls [COCOM]. As is well known, this abbreviation conceals the coordinating committee for controlling exports to the socialist countries, of which almost all the NATO countries and Japan are members. The committee compiles lists of goods which it is forbidden to sell to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Initially both the U.S. and the Italian sides tried to belittle the importance of the demarche, asserting that it was merely a case of a U.S. "request" to check information received from the intelligence service. The Olivetti firm, which was named among the main "culprits," hastened to state that it had violated no rules, that it has been cooperating with the Soviet Union for 30 years now on the basis of licenses issued by the Italian Government.

But it became known that the Italian Prime Minister had discussed this question directly with Olivetti chief C. de Benedetti. Foreign Minister G. de Michelis and Secretary of State J. Baker have also discussed it. THE WASHINGTON POST and London's SUNDAY TIMES have published reports asserting that the secretly purchased equipment is being used by the Soviet Union to produce a sophisticated vertical take-off fighter.

The newspaper L'UNITA believes that the story is based not on the fear of secrets being leaked but rather on the struggle for the Soviet technology market which is being waged without too much concern for correctness by U.S., Japanese, and European companies. Nor is it ruled out that some people across the ocean do not like the more flexible stance adopted by Italy with regard to the development of relations with the European socialist countries and in particular with the USSR.

Incidentally, a local television program showed an item from which it followed that the Americans have in mind metal-cutting machine tools with numerical program control. If that is so then Olivetti's cooperation with Soviet enterprises has long been widely known. Incidentally, THE SUNDAY TIMES has also reported that the firm began its "criminal" deliveries to the USSR back in 1984, also providing servicing for the equipment.

October Soviet-French Meetings 'Unprecedented'

*90UI0028A Moscow TRUD in Russian
10 Oct 89 p 3*

[Interview with V.V. Zagladin, advisor on international affairs to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by V. Prokofyev, TRUD staff correspondent: "We Are Building a Common European Home;" interview conducted on the occasion of the conclusion of Soviet-French meeting "Dialogue-89"; datelined Paris, 9 October]

[Text] More than 320 "ambassadors of perestroyka," representing all the republics of the USSR and brimming with the most diverse impressions of France and the French, returned home Sunday. Prior to their flight from Paris, I approached the leader of our delegation, V.V. Zagladin, advisor to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet on international affairs, and asked him to answer a few questions.

[Prokofyev] Vadim Valentinovich, how would you evaluate the results of the "Soviet landing" in France?

[Zagladin] A major event. It is the first time such a representative grouping of Soviet society has visited France. The most important aspect, in my opinion, was the content and richness of the meetings which took place. They were unprecedented. The meetings were organized by the "France-USSR" society, which left its mark on our work—we were meeting with friends.

The president of the French Republic received us all in the Elysee Palace and, along with the Senate and National Assembly, spent time with our delegation. Valuable discussions took place with the leaders of the country's main political parties, with trade union associations, and with many state and social organizations. This was a meeting with France, with all of its strata, with its political and social forces, and it came at a crucial time.

On the one hand, "Dialogue-89" took place soon after M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France and his important talks with President Mitterand, and after the conclusion here of an unprecedented number of bilateral agreements (22). And so our meeting progressed in much the same current of ideas born on those days of July. On the other hand, the situation in Europe is such that relations between the USSR and France are acquiring a special meaning. I have in mind the common European process and the significant participation our countries have been devoting to it since the very beginning. Now, along with this we also see attempts to destabilize the situation on the continent. Under such conditions, Soviet-French cooperation holds great significance.

There were a great many discussions on a thousand issues. If I were to try to identify the main questions, I would name two and would formulate them in the following manner—what kind of role France can play in support of our perestroyka; and, secondly, the place of the USSR and France in supporting peace, consolidating positive trends, and overcoming negative ones.

[Prokofyev] If we want to address how the French are relating to processes taking place in our country, what conclusion would you draw from your numerous contacts?

[Zagladin] I see practical assistance being rendered to us today in an atmosphere of good will and interest in the Soviet Union. Local surveys of public opinion show a swiftly growing liking for us. We will recall that, until recently, France lagged behind such states as the FRG, Great Britain, and Italy in this regard. Today it has caught up with them and might even have shot ahead.

[Prokofyev] Popular diplomacy is exerting a more and more active influence on state diplomacy. How do you see the results of "Dialogue-89" in this regard?

[Zagladin] During our meeting with President Mitterand, one of our comrades asked his opinion of popular diplomacy. The President stated that in the final analysis the people must have the last word. Then he added: "It would be better if they had the first word as well." In 1987 a large French delegation came to our country and met with M.S. Gorbachev. It was precisely then that popular diplomacy met up with highest-level diplomacy. The same thing happened in Paris—reception of "Dialogue-89" participants by the president of the country. This is something new in Soviet-French relations.

[Prokofyev] How do you see the role of society in the construction of a common European home?

[Zagladin] It is clear following the successful conclusion of the Vienna meeting that the common European process is gathering steam and acquiring specific content. We were asked during the Paris meetings—when will the construction itself begin? It is already underway. The foundation stones have already been laid and a structure of relationships is being erected. During his July visit to France, M.S. Gorbachev traveled to Strasbourg and spoke at the Council of Europe. We have established contacts with this organization. A Council of Europe-USSR working group session has already taken place. An agreement has been reached regarding the prospect of our country joining in certain conventions drawn up in Strasbourg for our permanent participation in the work of the council. And now, in October, yet another circumstance has been pointed out: The common European process, begun on the state level, is presently acquiring the character of a people's structure. Thus, construction is underway at the top and the bottom. This is an important combination in which one aspect supplements the other.

Delegation Head on Visit to Council of Europe

PM1310085189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with A.P. Vladislavlev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing, by P. Golub: "Success Cannot Be Achieved in Isolation"—place, date of interview not specified; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation has returned to Moscow from Strasbourg, where it took part in the work of the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly's 41st session. We asked A.P. Vladislavlev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing and head of the delegation, to describe the purpose and results of this trip.

[Vladislavlev] The purpose of our trip to Strasbourg was to mark the beginning of direct cooperation between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly. Let me remind readers that last June the assembly of this organ, which unites 23 West European states, decided to grant our country and Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary the status of "specially invited" state. The Supreme Soviet nominated a delegation of 18 deputies who were instructed to establish working contacts with the Parliamentary Assembly and to implement this cooperation.

[Golub] What specific forms of cooperation did you succeed in accomplishing in Strasbourg?

[Vladislavlev] We had a very busy stay in Strasbourg. We had meetings with Parliamentary Assembly Chairman A. Bjork and Council of Europe Secretary General C. Lalumiere. We had conversations with members of all factions and took part in the work of a whole series of commissions which opened widely their doors to us. For example, Academician Yu. Gulyayev addressed the Commission for Science; P. Bunich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, addressed the Economic Commission; Doctor of Juridical Sciences A. Yakovlev addressed the Juridical Commission; V. Gorokhov, director of the "Losinyy Ostrov" State National Natural Reserve, took part in the work of the Commission for Environmental Protection; and teacher Sh. Amonashvili took part in the Education Commission's work.

Let me emphasize that we never expected such a warm and keen welcome. We perceived a clearly expressed desire on the Western parliamentarians' part not only to find out as much as possible about our country but also to establish the closest and most effective cooperation. Deputies from the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly emphasized that they perceived our arrival at the session as the beginning of the specific implementation of the ideas of a "common European home," expressed by M.S. Gorbachev in his speech to the Council of Europe last July.

During our debates we came to the unanimous opinion that large-scale cooperation between the Supreme Soviet and the Parliamentary Assembly is exceptionally important for us all. We agreed that our people's deputies should, already this year, participate in conferences and seminars organized by the assembly's commissions.

[Golub] What practical lessons were learned from the trip to Strasbourg by the delegation's members in their capacity as people's deputies?

[Vladislavlev] First of all, we were impressed by the level of integration between the states belonging to the Council of Europe and by the readiness they display to forego narrow national interests for the sake of solving much more important global questions. During the Council of Europe's existence its members have elaborated and adopted over 100 conventions covering the most diverse aspects of life and human activity. These states have truly achieved a qualitatively new level of integration enabling them to advance much faster. Experience shows that today not even the most developed country can solve a single one of the global problems in isolation. This applies to power supply, food supplies, scientific research, and ecology alike.

After we reported to the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee on the results of the trip to Strasbourg, it was decided to immediately conduct an expert study of conventions concluded within the Council of Europe framework so that, by the time of the Parliamentary Assembly's next session in January, a decision can be made to join at least some of them.

Soviet-Turkish Cooperation Meeting Opens

PM1710133789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Commission Session"]

[Text] The 12th session of the Soviet-Turkish Joint Commission for Economic Cooperation opened in

Moscow 16 October. The Soviet section of the commission is headed by K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations; while the Turkish delegation is headed by E. Pakdemirli, Turkish minister of finance and customs. Also taking part in the session's work are S. Yurur, Turkish minister of industry and commerce; V. Vural, Turkish ambassador to the USSR; and A.S. Chernyshev, USSR ambassador to Turkey.

Questions relating to the further development of trade and economic ties between the two neighboring countries, progress in fulfilling mutual commitments, the prospects for cooperation in building industrial and other projects in Turkey, the USSR, and other countries, questions of the development of border and coastal trade, and shipments of Turkish consumer goods to the USSR will be examined.

Business cooperation committees from the two countries, in which the leaders of major Turkish companies and Soviet organizations and enterprises participate, have started operating in Moscow.

Latin America & Caribbean

Panamanian Emergency Laws Declared in Force

LD1110110889 Moscow TASS in English 1005 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Text] Panama October 11 TASS—The acting President of Panama Francisco Rodriguez has endorsed the emergency laws passed by the cabinet.

As pointed out in the communique released after the government's session, the country's leadership is compelled to take temporary measures to prevent a national crisis due to the continuing U.S. aggression and economic blockade.

It has been decided to freeze the wages of state employees and to stop paying year-end bonuses. Prices on foodstuffs, prime necessities, rent, electricity, water and telephone will be frozen simultaneously. The money saved will be spent on social projects, primarily on education, public health, construction, and cultural projects.

Several measures are intended to improve the work of law enforcement organs in order to stop provocations, sabotage, and other illegal actions. According to the Panama Ministry of Internal Affairs a curfew is still in force in the country.

The U.S. war bases in Panama have been transferred from "Delta" to "Charley" alert, restricting movements of U.S. personnel and maintaining third degree readiness of U.S. South Command forces.

Radio Moscow Role in Chilean Resistance Viewed

PY1510033889 Moscow Radio Magallanes in Spanish to Chile 0100 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Commentary by Chilean journalist Rolando Carrasco]

[Text] We had been left completely alone and isolated from the world, the popular government had been overthrown, the dictatorship had scattered concentration camps and anonymous dead around the country, congress was closed, all leftist communication media were also closed, and the image of the dictatorship monopolized the television screens. Pinochet needed to be left alone in order to consolidate his power by murdering his opponents. At the same time, he sent missions abroad to seek recognition and support.

In the first days immediately after the coup, Radio Moscow began to beam programs to Chile, and I am now talking to you from its studios. Volodia Teitelboim, current secretary general of the Chilean Communist Party, was by chance in Moscow in September 1973, and it fell to him to initiate the programs "Listen, Chile" [Escucha, Chile] and Radio Magallanes over the microphones of Radio Moscow. The audience of these programs suddenly grew inside Chile.

At first, the programs denounced the arbitrary action of the military regime. It was difficult to smuggle news out of Chile so that it could be broadcast all over Chile by Radio Moscow, but news of the world's solidarity was broadcast night after night to Chile. Thus, the wall of silence the dictator intended to raise around him to hide his crimes was cracked.

A tradition of listening to Radio Moscow programs in Latin America was developed in Chile as attested by the mail that reached its studios. The bulk of mail from Chile confirms this. So it was easy to see that the Moscow transmissions were helping the cause of the persecuted, the workers, the students, the prisoners, the muzzled democrats, and the grieving widows of Chile. Through these transmissions, those people received the message of support and encouragement sent by the peoples of the world.

The first broadcasts were made in those years, and very few have not listened to them at some time, although nobody admitted to knowledge of those programs. The tyrant himself violently attacked the programs in several public speeches. Not long ago, Pinochet's foreign minister again scathingly referred to Radio Moscow's broadcasts. That is to say that those programs have continued to affect the dictatorship in one way or another and that they have helped the resurgence of the democratic forces. The resurgence and organization of the democratic forces through the impetus of the workers and broad sectors of the population have reshaped the Chilean political situation, to the point that we are now approaching the real possibility of an electoral triumph by a single opposition candidate to the presidency, thus setting the process of transition in motion.

In fact the situation not only has changed in Chile, but also in the Soviet Union where perestroyka—a revolutionary process inside a revolution—has opened immense possibilities for the economic, social, and political development of Soviet society. We frequently keep you abreast of these developments in the programs of Radio Moscow. So, all this has galvanized our disposition to continue cooperating in this process that has reached new levels.

Our programs continue to be open and at the disposal of all advance forces that march with the democrats. A few weeks ago, Radio Moscow completed 16 years of broadcast to Chile. Now, on 29 October Radio Moscow will celebrate its 60th anniversary. All the peoples of the world know the programs of Radio Moscow in 81 (?languages). The programs to Chile have a privileged place among them. For the occasion, greetings have been sent to the programs of Radio Moscow and Radio Magallanes. From Chileans scattered in 40 countries by the fascist explosion, Radio Moscow also receives mail and postcard with messages of appreciation and thanks. This is a modest way of responding to the valuable assistance Radio Moscow has given, is giving, and will continue to give us.

We had been left alone, isolated from the world, and Radio Moscow proved to be our friend during shameful times. Good night.

'Special Anniversary Program' To Air

PY1610211489 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2100 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Radio Moscow International will soon mark 60 years in the service of democracy through broadcasts in 77 languages and the transmission of its message of peace and humanism to the five continents, where it is tuned in every day and night by more than 100 million listeners who make up its workdwide family.

Events of historical importance, crucial moments in the development of a vital and complex world, protagonists, and prospects for perestroyka—all of this has been paraded in programs reflecting today's exciting life as we celebrate 60 years of broadcasting abroad and 57 years of broadcasting in Spanish.

Radio Moscow International is marking its 60th anniversary as a radio station serving peace, friendship among peoples, social progress, and truth. This is the radio of glasnost, democratization, and perestroyka, a forum on the air that has featured Latin American figures such as Salvador Allende, Ernesto Che Guevara, Fidel Castro, Rodney Arismendi, Pablo Neruda, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Luis Echevarria, Nicolas Guillen, Raul Gonzalez Tunon, and many others.

This is a great bridge between the ebullient world of the Soviet Union and the equally intense life of Latin America.

This coming 29 October, when Radio Moscow International marks the 60 years it has been on the air since 1929, the programs Escucha Chile Radio Magallanes will carry a special anniversary program that will include special greetings from Volodia Teitelboim, Communist Party of Chile secretary general, an outstanding Chilean writer, and a collaborator with Radio Moscow.

Radio Moscow International will soon celebrate its 60th anniversary.

Supreme Soviet Session

Deputy Alekseyev Discusses Constitutional Reform

90UN0054A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 7 Oct 89 p 1

[Report on interview with S.S. Alekseyev, people's deputy, chairman of the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet on Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by T. Boykova: "The Happiness and Fate of the People..."]

[Text] Until quite recently one's hand would almost automatically write: "The entire country is celebrating this nationwide holiday..." Today these words somehow do not come out. Holidays seem out of place in a home where everything is torn up for capital repair—the bad roof has been removed, the rotted floors have been torn up... And the Constitution—our country's basic code of laws—might quite possibly be compared to the foundation. The house rests on it. And if all of a sudden it has shifted dangerously and cracks have begun to appear, this means that not all is well with this foundation. Let us take a closer look at it.

When going to meet with S.S. Alekseyev I grabbed a small book, what they call a gift edition. The cover is of red leather, and near the top is a colored enamel medallion with a skillful depiction of our state coat of arms and thick gilded letters: The Constitution (Basic Law) of the USSR.

[Boykova] Sergey Sergeyevich, I am ashamed to admit that just today perhaps for the first time I have read its articles so attentively and scrupulously.

[Alekseyev] That is a shame...

[Boykova] I shall explain. Look at the principles the Constitution proclaims... Here for instance: "The most important issues of state life are brought up for nationwide discussion, and are also raised for nationwide voting (referendum)"; "USSR citizens have the right to work...to recreation, to health protection...material support in old age".... One could go on, but a reasonable question arises—but why? Why talk about the guarantee of the right to work when we have millions who against their will are not working or, as they are called throughout the world, unemployed? Why should a kolkhoz worker read the article about the right to recreation if he has no idea of what it is to take his entire family and go to a Sochi sanatorium? Why should an old peasant read the article on the right to health protection if within a 20-verst range there is no such thing as a medical facility or even a paramedic? And there is a huge number of these questions. Why?

[Alekseyev] Because the current Constitution and many of its articles, unfortunately, are mainly declarative in nature. Or to some decree there is even a shade of farce....Yet the constitution should be for the people, for instance, as the Bible is for those who believe. Because it is the basis of the guarantees of their freedoms, their personal safety, and their peaceful democratic existence...

[Boykova] It is no accident that I turned to S.S. Alekseyev, a person who, to put it mildly, is very busy. He and the committee of which he is in charge, in addition to legislation, have been instructed to deal with the new constitution so it will be workable, so the main law will no longer be so flexible that it can be interpreted any which way. This work, which is truly gigantic in its significance and scale, is still in its initial stage. It will be undertaken by a special constitutional commission whose composition was approved by the First USSR Congress of People's Deputies. But...

[Alekseyev] But it is not yet underway for a number of reasons and therefore all questions related to the constitution are being handled by our committee.

[Boykova] Sergey Sergeyevich, the history of our state already includes four variants of the basic law—constitutions were adopted in 1918, 1924, 1936, and 1977, while in certain other countries these documents survive for centuries. In your opinion, which requirements should the new text meet?

[Alekseyev] Today we are solving the problem of building society on democratic, humane principles. The new text should also be a constitution of democratic, humane socialism. It should be not only a political and legal document, but also a profoundly moral one. And as such the new constitution should be intended precisely for centuries.

[Boykova] But today our society is experiencing a transition period and a good deal in it is unstable, eroded, and shaky... How long do you think it will take to prepare the new text so it will last for centuries?

[Alekseyev] I was asked that question a half year ago and I answered: It will take a year and a half. And today I repeat: a year and a half. This, incidentally, is not saying much. It is simply difficult to imagine the amount of work that lies ahead. It will be necessary to have careful, well thought-out preparation. We are now working on specific topics and a preliminary interpretation of approaches and concepts related to all these problems. Much has simply not been determined yet...

[Boykova] For example, the problem of property relations...

[Alekseyev] Partially, yes. But at the same time many viewpoints have already appeared. For example, it is asserted that there should be a diversity of forms of property, that they should hold equal positions in the economic and social structures, that there should be no private property involving the exploitation of man. That is, a number of fundamental principles have been determined. We are speaking about developing them into legal norms.

[Boykova] What can you say about radical changes in specific articles? For instance, that same Article 6—"The Communist Party... is the guiding and directive force..."

[Alekseyev] I think this article will be corrected along with many others. The party should function as the vanguard of the people and not as a force that exercises direct control over everything and anything as is reflected in the text of the current Constitution.

[Boykova] Will the new text contain, for instance, a mechanism which will make all citizens of the state—from the rank-and-file member to the president—equal before the law? So everyone will be equally responsible to it. So there will be no repetition, for example, of such a thing as happened in Afghanistan when the decision to send in troops was made by an extremely small number of individuals whom, incidentally, the general public still does not know so there is nobody to hold responsible?

[Alekseyev] I think the new constitution will definitely envision that. So that, say, troops cannot cross the border without the sanction of the Supreme Soviet. There are already preliminary developments concerning this kind of "mechanism."

[Boykova] During the time the current Constitution has been in existence we have adopted such an immense number of all kinds of normative acts, laws, decisions, and decrees that sometimes the constitutional provisions have not only been concealed or lost under the heap of them, but have also essentially been crossed out. Will the new document contain an "antidote" to such a phenomenon? Or are there some other variants of this?

[Alekseyev] Well, in the first place when we now work on a certain draft law, we must look at the provisions of the Constitution. And if they do not correspond to the new developments in even the slightest way we suggest an amendment to the Constitution. Our committee holds fairly rigid positions here. For example, we are now working on a law concerning property again and at the same time we are preparing a proposal to amend the Constitution. But in order for certain acts or even laws adopted subsequently not to contradict the Constitution, it is simply necessary to observe it and proceed from it. This is the reason for the formation of the committee for constitutional supervision. It will be the "antidote."

[Boykova] What will its activity consist of, taking into account the immense scale of our country?

[Alekseyev] It is still too early to say specifically, for we have only a draft law. From all appearances it will operate both on its own initiative and at the request of various republics and state organs if they think there have been violations of provisions of the Constitution or acts that contradict it have been adopted.

[Boykova] How is the work for creating this committee proceeding?

[Alekseyev] We have now developed a draft of the law on constitutional supervision. It will apparently be discussed at the next congress of people's deputies. And a committee will be formed. The decision was first to develop the law and then to select the committee.

[Boykova] With all my heart I wish you success in such complicated and important work. The wish is not unselfish—every one of us without exception is vitally interested in this.

[Alekseyev] There are some old, old lines that everyone has known for a long time:

The happiness and fate of the people hinge on bread and freedom above all.

Behind this stands the Constitution. It is the guarantee that finally in our country there will be no orphaned, offended, unfortunate people, each will have his "daily bread" and each will be able to work freely and generally be a free person.

Panels Discuss Local Elections 11 Oct

PM1710112589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Commissions. Elections to Republic and Local Soviets Are a Task for All the Party"]

[Text] A joint sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Questions of Party Building and Cadre Policy, the Commission for Legal Policy, and the Ideology Commission was held 11 October. Questions of the preparations for elections to the republic and local organs of power were discussed.

The session was opened by an introductory speech by V.A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. A report on the question under discussion was delivered by G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

During the exchange of opinions it was noted that the elections of USSR people's deputies held this spring reflected the fundamental changes that have taken place in society's socioeconomic, political, and spiritual life, and, at the same time, the complexity and contradictory nature of the modern stage of perestroyka. The voters, resolutely supporting perestroyka, advocate that the pace of perestroyka be accelerated and that practical results be achieved more rapidly. In this connection the work of party, soviet, and economic organs and leading cadres was assessed in a demanding fashion. Questions such as disruption to everyday supplies of prime necessities to the population, the organization of the trading system, the services sphere, and city transport, the sanitary condition of cities and villages, the inadequate struggle against mismanagement and violations of law and order, the failure to solve economic problems, and the sometimes disparaging attitude to cultural monuments have become politically acute. Many party committees have found themselves unprepared for work in this new democratic situation, have clung to old approaches, have permitted complacency, and have hoped that voters would place their trust in them through a knee-jerk response.

It is important that the proper lessons are drawn from the past election campaign, all the more so as the forthcoming elections will be a major landmark in the implementation of political reform and in applying the measures linked with modernizing republic and local state organs of power, introducing regional economic accountability, local self-management, and self-financing, and boosting the role and responsibility of the soviets. It is important that, as a result of the elections, capable soviets able to actually implement their powers and to work in a new and enterprising way be formed.

The election campaign will be held during the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress. This will increase the responsibility of party organizations, which should operate vigorously, relying on political methods, and skillfully work with voters under the most varied conditions. The decisions of the CPSU Central Committee September (1989) Plenum, which elaborated a fundamental position with regard to nationalities policy and other major questions of the CPSU's activity, are of great importance for organizing the pre-election work.

The questions of organizational and mass political work were comprehensively discussed at the commissions' sitting. The unacceptability both of a passive neutral position on the part of party organizations in the election campaign, and of relying on the force of directives and resolutions was stressed. It is important that their work promote the nomination to the soviets of effective and prestigious people who understand the population's needs and are able to act competently under the new conditions. Such people are to be found in all strata—among workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia. It was also stated that the soviets should reflect the interests of women, young people, and veterans. Proper representation in the soviets for the nationalities was a subject of attention.

Attention was drawn to the need to profoundly analyze the relationship between general political, republic, and local problems, which will undoubtedly appear in the election campaign and which should be reflected when elaborating election platforms.

It was stressed that all the preparatory work for the elections should be conducted openly and publicly, consulting with working people and actively involving them in the election process. Constructive cooperation should be organized with all forces acting to benefit perestroyka. We should actively oppose attempts—from whatever quarter—to "collect votes" with demagogic statements and empty promises. The great role of the media, which is called upon to ensure equal conditions for candidate deputies in the election campaign and to comprehensively cover the campaign from principled positions, was stressed. The commissions' sitting expressed the conviction that during the election campaign it will be necessary to protect socialist choice and socialist values, and to reveal the real purport and aims of perestroyka.

The Leninist principles of close links between the party and the masses, consideration for the sentiments and aspirations of the masses, and the correct assessment of the realities of life should determine the overall approaches in party organizations' work. But the main thing that ensures the success of this work is the real improvement in the socioeconomic situation, attention to people's needs, and the satisfaction of their urgent requirements. In this connection great attention has been devoted to problems requiring immediate resolution both centrally and locally.

Sixteen people spoke during the exchange of opinions. The results of the discussion were summed up by V.A. Medvedev. Taking part in the commissions' work were V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, who spoke at the sitting; Politburo candidate members A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and B.K. Pugo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee; and A.N. Girenko, Yu.A. Manayenkov, and G.I. Usmanov, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee.

Panels Debate Language, Enterprise Laws 12 Oct

PM1710134789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Session Diary"]

[Text] Should there be a statewide law on the languages of our country's peoples? The joint sitting of two commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities—that on nationalities policy and interethnic relations, and also that on questions of developing culture, language, and national and international traditions—on 12 October was devoted to this problem.

The draft Law on the Languages of the USSR Peoples presented for the deputies' examination was the reason for the sitting. And the basis for the discussion which flared up was the adoption by the Baltic republics and the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] of their own national laws on the state language which, in the opinion of a number of deputies, infringe the rights of the nonindigenous population.

Representatives of the Baltic union republics said that they adopted the laws because of distortions in nationalities policy in the USSR over a period of many decades whereby the languages spoken by the indigenous population were gradually squeezed out by Russian even from spheres such as culture.

Weighty words in this discussion were uttered by People's Deputy Daniil Granin, the well-known writer, who stated that edicts and strong-arm methods are unacceptable in solving the delicate language problems. By virtue of historical practice, Russian has been and remains the language common to all the country's peoples. At the same time all the other languages must have the chance to develop freely and be used equally, but particular concern should be shown to preserve disappearing languages. An "ecological" approach to them is needed—treating them as a common national asset. It is precisely this approach which must be the basis of the statewide law, which is certainly necessary since it guarantees the legal protection of languages of large and small peoples.

Opening the sitting 12 October, B.G. Vasilyev, deputy chairman of the Commission for Questions of the Development of Industry, Energy, Equipment, and Technology, introduced to the gathering the experts invited to attend it who had taken part in the work on the package of draft laws on ownership and socialist enterprise. At the deputies' request G.G. Melikyan, one of the draft's coauthors, presented the concept of the new Law on the Socialist Enterprise.

Deputy B.V. Kryzhkov, who most vigorously opposed the authors of the draft, stated that the proposed law does not contain sufficient guarantees for democratizing production relations. In his opinion, the law does not contain the main point: It does not create for the socialist enterprise all the conditions to ensure that it alone, and not the ministry, disposes of the output produced at the enterprise.

The most important package of draft laws on the second session's agenda, of draft laws determining the efficiency of the activity of the economic reform's main link—the socialist enterprise—will be discussed by the standing commission for several more days.

More on Armenian Deputies' Supreme Soviet Walkout

NC1610141689 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Excerpts] Moscow, 13 Oct (ARMENPRES)—The deliberations of the USSR Supreme Soviet entered their 2d week with a debate on various problems pertaining to the country's economic life. However, one acute problem, that is the situation which has emerged in Armenia and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] as a result of the railway and road blockade and the consequences of this illegal and unfriendly act, has not yet been examined, the culprits not identified, and the blockade not given a political assessment. [passage omitted]

No complications were expected during the 10 October morning session. The deputies were following the agenda and debating issues related to price formation. Following a short recess, the session was addressed by L. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, on the railway situation in Azerbaijan and the condition and type of freight being received. [passage omitted]

To indicate their disagreement with the fact that the issue of the blockade had not been opened up to debate, the people's deputies from Armenia and NKAO walked out of the congress hall.

They issued a statement addressed to the USSR Supreme Soviet and submitted it to Lukyanov, the chairman of the session. The statement reads:

"The NKAO has been blockaded for the last year and a half, while Armenia has been blockaded for the past 2 months. All our efforts to open a debate on the situation and find a way out of the impasse have been resolutely rejected and have had no result. The resolution endorsed today on the blockade adds virtually nothing to earlier decisions. Therefore the Armenian and NKAO deputies had to walk out of the hall.

"This act was not intended to show disrespect for the Supreme Soviet. We are deeply grateful to all deputies who sympathize with our misfortune.

"We left the hall because of our powerlessness, because of the impossibility of solving the crisis through parliamentary methods.

"We left the hall to draw our colleagues' attention to the situation in which the Armenian deputies find themselves.

"We request that a political assessment be given to the blockade of the NKAO and Armenia because we think that only in this way can the efforts to lift the blockade succeed and prevent a recurrence of the blockade.

"We request that the lifting of the blockade on the NKAO and Armenia be deliberated in a calm and respectful atmosphere so that the correct and nonviolent means of lifting the blockade can be found.

"We request the announcement of at least tentative dates for the discussion of the NKAO problem. We believe that this would check the further escalation of violence in the region.

"We request that this statement be publicized at the Supreme Soviet session."

The Armenian deputies' statement was issued at the USSR Supreme Soviet's evening session.

S. Khanzadyan, USSR people's deputy and writer, told ARMENPRES reporters: We disagreed with the resolution which was adopted soon after Voronin's address. Not only was the resolution meaningless, but it divided responsibility for the blockade between Armenia and Azerbaijan, which in no way corresponds to reality. To indicate our disagreement we left the congress hall.

[ARMENPRES] Yet there were Armenian deputies in the hall during the evening session.

[Khanzatyan] That's correct. At the request of the deputies from Armenia and the NKAO, USSR People's Deputies S. Arutyunyan and G. Voskanyan were present at the evening session in case our statement was discussed, as they were the most closely involved in its preparation.

Commission Discusses Administrative Spending

PM1710132389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Oct 89 Morning Edition p2

[V. Romanyuk report under the rubric "In the USSR Supreme Soviet Committees and Commissions": "Diminishing Apparatus, Growing Expenditure..."]

[Text] What does it cost the treasury to maintain the national economic management apparatus? Quite a lot: R44 billion a year! And the first question asked by deputies at a scheduled sitting of the Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission was whether this expenditure is justified.

Strictly speaking, R6 billion of this sum is needed to maintain administrative organs, while the remaining R38 billion is used to pay the wages of administrators of enterprises and organizations. Labor collectives spend their hard-earned money on them and, as USSR Finance Minister V.S. Pavlov pointed out, will continue to do so as long as the economic mechanism allows this to happen. And it does still allow this to happen.

Union and republic departments, the scaling down of which we are all following with a watchful eye, have a fairly modest budget of approximately R880 million. The apparatus at oblast and rayon level, including the executive committees [ispolkoms] of soviets of people's deputies, has R3.6 billion; just over R250 million goes on the maintenance of legal and juridical institutions; slightly less goes on the upkeep of social organizations; and it costs the treasury R360 million to maintain economic management organs and R500 million to maintain organs of management of cooperative organizations.

The complexity of the task deputies have set themselves lies not only in the vast number of channels through which resources are spent on the apparatus but also in the number of sources of these resources. For instance, union ministries exist on budget resources and also on centralized funds made up of payments by enterprises. In this connection, deputies raised the question of abolishing all mandatory payments: Payments must be purely voluntary and spent on those administrative organs which really need them.

How many administrators do we in fact need? In the United States, the state administrative apparatus consists of 1 million people. In our country, the figure is 1,685,000, or just over 50 percent more. In a planned economy the administrative apparatus could not be any smaller and, as scientific and technical progress grows, it will actually increase in size. It now comprises 12.7 percent of the number of people engaged in social production. Within the administrative organs themselves, the apparatus has been reduced by 332,000 people during the current 5-year period but, on the other hand, the number of administrators at enterprises and organizations has risen by 414,000. Surveys carried out at enterprises in various sectors show that production management, structure, and staffs are essentially the same as they were under the centralized system of management. Having unlimited rights with regard to taking on staff, enterprises often resolve difficulties not by radically restructuring production management but by increasing the number of personnel. It is even reaching the stage where the number of workers is falling. Yu.N. Baryshnikov, chief of the USSR Finance Ministry department responsible for financing the administrative apparatus, cited the following fact: In the "Kabbalkenergo" apparatus, one in four working people is an administrator and, what is more, the salary of office employees is 150 percent higher than that of ordinary workers.

An effective measure to counter the swelling apparatus of enterprises and associations must be to raise the payment for administrators—it will increase from R300 to R600. In this connection Deputy V.M. Semenov proposed that this procedure be extended to engineering and technical workers and employees in the central administrative apparatus.

Expenditure on the state apparatus continues to increase. To a certain extent this is connected with the restructuring of the Soviet political system and the strengthening of legal organs (it is planned to increase allocations for courts and public prosecutor's offices by almost R150 million). As far as the USSR Council of Ministers is concerned, cuts have only affected capital construction. On the other hand, it is planned to increase allocations for the maintenance of new structural subdivisions of the government and its social needs.

"We talk about scaling down the apparatus, but expenditure is continuing to grow," commission chairman V.G. Kucherenko said in bewilderment.

He quoted the following facts: During the reorganization of the apparatus there have been personnel increases in 13 out of 22 ministries. The explanation is simple: During the elimination of all-union production associations, part of their apparatus has been incorporated into the ministries and reductions have mainly been achieved by eliminating vacant posts and retiring people; the number of those who have moved into the production sphere could be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Deputy A.G. Mukhtarov drew attention to the following reserve: Reduce the size of various institutions in which officials who have been given the ax largely settle. Say, for example, that a total of 800 people are employed in the Central Asian Institute of Land Reclamation. Do we really need so many people to ensure that irrigation channels are built? And how many "subsidiary" institutions attached to ministries are there in addition to this, which are maintained by the state?

The Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission sees its main task as being to make the maximum possible cuts in budget expenditure. The R38 billion spent on enterprise administrators comes out of income generated under the economic accountability system and therefore would appear to have no direct bearing on the budget. But, despite this, the heightened expenditure weighs on prime costs, reduces profits, and ultimately reduces budget revenue.

The commission sitting cited cases of excessive payments being made from the material incentive fund. In some planning institutes, they have reached 90 and even 100 monthly-salary payments per year! The commission intends to propose a legislative initiative to restrict bonus payments to 6 monthly-salary payments per year. The problem is extremely relevant. The wages of association and enterprise directors were made public at the sitting. They require no comment: In the coal industry directors receive an average of R1,036 per month; in the machine-building sector—between R604 and R1,110 per month; in ferrous metallurgy—between R793 and R1,252 per month; in the chemical industry—between R790 and R992 per month; and in the construction industry—between R610 and R1,114 per month.

Deputies were totally amazed when they heard the figure for the planned increase in expenditure on the manufacture of...government awards. Against R5 million in 1989, it is planned to increase expenditure on this item to R13.5 million in 1990. The economy is in a really bad way, deputies said, and we are going to give out awards?! It seems that the increased expenditure reflects the rising price of precious metals. In actual fact, three times fewer government awards are going to be made, and, of these, half of the costs will go on producing "Veteran of Labor" medals.

Deputies very scrupulously analyzed the items of expenditure of the USSR Supreme Soviet itself. Let us compare: The U.S. Congress is served by 34,000 staffers, whereas the apparatus serving the Supreme Soviet consists of just 600 people. The cost of holding congresses, sessions, and sittings of committees and commissions totals R26.4 million each year. This is considerably more than the amount spent on the old, ritual sessions which usually lasted 1 ½ days. Now, however, we have a working parliament. Money is needed to equip parliamentarians' offices and to acquire computers and cars for the Supreme Soviet car fleet. These are necessary outlays.

There was possibly only one item of expenditure that did not give rise to any debate: Maintenance of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs organs. The rise in crime in the country forces us to strengthen our law enforcement organs and supply them with the necessary equipment. This equipment includes radio units, armored personnel carriers, and means for individual protection. The draft budget proposes to allocate an additional R500 million for these purposes. The basic salary for junior command staff in the internal forces has been increased.

The sitting of the Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission also touched on the question of the size and budget of social organizations. The USSR Finance Ministry was unable to provide the relevant figures. But there are questions in this area. Deputies spoke in favor of the Supreme Soviet taking control of the financial activity and budget of all social organizations without exception.

Amendments to Cooperatives Law Debated 16 Oct

PM1810133589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Dolganov and V. Kurasov report under the rubric "At the Second Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet": "Amendments to the Law. IZVESTIYA Parliamentary Correspondents Report"]

[Text] Opening the morning session, A.I. Lukyanov in the chair reported that certain amendments were being made to the schedule for joint work between the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities today too. On 16 October it is planned to examine three issues: the question of streamlining cooperatives' trading and purchasing activities and regulating the prices of goods (services) sold by cooperatives to the population; the question of the draft law on the general principles of the leadership of the economy and the social sphere in the union republics; and the question of the draft law on ownership in the USSR.

Deputy A.A. Sobchak spoke on the first point on the agenda on behalf of the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order. He told the sitting participants about the progress of work on the draft USSR Supreme Soviet resolution, and briefly described its main provisions.

The resolution reaffirms the USSR Supreme Soviet's unswerving line of supporting the cooperative movement and creating stable conditions for the independent economic management of all cooperatives operating in accordance with the law. At the same time, the draft proposes recognizing that exploitation of the difficult position prevailing in the consumer market in order to hike prices of goods and to earn unjustified income runs counter to the basic principles of cooperatives' activity. One of the paragraphs in the draft proposes prohibiting cooperatives from engaging in trading, purchasing, and brokerage activities associated with buying up and reselling industrial goods and foodstuffs in the state trading and consumer cooperative system's retail and wholesale network.

The USSR Council of Ministers has been instructed to carry out the necessary measures to step up financial and banking control over the activities of cooperatives in the spheres of production and services and to strengthen tax inspections.

The USSR Ministry of Finance and its local organs are to ensure that tax services work effectively, and that cooperatives account for all their income and pay their taxes in full.

A.A. Sobchak then answered questions from Deputies L.I. Matyukhin, Yu.I. Borodin, V.M. Desyatov, V.S. Shevchenko, and others.

Since certain provisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet draft resolution require corresponding amendments to the existing law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR," the chairman proposed discussing the expediency of such amendments.

Two proposals were put to the vote. Deputy V.A. Tikhonov and a number of others considered that it is necessary to examine the amendments to the law with certain editorial changes. Deputy A.D. Sakharov insisted that the Law on the Cooperative System should not be altered—this, as he put it, was the first child of perestroyka. In the deputy's opinion, we should place cooperatives and state enterprises on an equal footing and use economic measures rather than prohibitions.

After the debates the two amendments to Article 19, which specifies the system for organizing state control over the prices (tariffs) for output, work, and services sold by cooperatives, were adopted by a majority vote in the two Supreme Soviet chambers.

An amendment regulating the prices of goods imported by cooperatives for sale on the domestic market was adopted comparatively quickly.

But there were real arguments on the amendment to Article 40 Paragraph 2 of the Law on the Cooperative System. The committee had proposed the following draft amendment: "Leading workers at state management organs, state enterprises, organizations, and institutions, along with workers at these organs, enterprises, organizations, and institutions who monitor cooperatives' activities shall not be permitted to become members of cooperatives in the production and services spheres or to work in them under labor contract." This formula prompted objections from many deputies, who believe that very many people should not be suspected of criminal intent from the outset. Deputies V.I. Matviyenko, R.A. Medvedev, I.O. Bisher, Yu.Yu. Boldyrev, I.A. Andreyeva, V.I. Voskoboynikov, and others took part in the discussion.

A.I. Lukyanov proposed a recess and asked the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order to take another look at the amendment and the proposals made by deputies during the discussion. After the recess A.A. Sobchak analyzed all the proposals and familiarized the session participants with the new version of Article 40 Paragraph 2 of the Law on the Cooperative System. After a brief discussion and the submission of certain clarifications this amendment was adopted.

The USSR law "On the Submission of Changes and Amendments to the USSR Law 'On the Cooperative System in the USSR'" was then adopted as a whole.

A final examination of the resolution streamlining cooperatives' trading and purchasing activities was carried forward to the 17 October plenary sitting. Following this the session continued its examination of the draft law on the general principles of management of the economy and the social sphere in the union republics.

Moscow TV Shows 17 Oct Supreme Soviet Session

1600 GMT

LD1710171789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 17 October begins carrying a recorded relay of the proceedings at the 17 October session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

Lukyanov announces registration: 435 deputies have registered to discuss the law on property. Speeches are to be restricted to 5 minutes.

At 1603, Deputy Arutyunyan speaks about the nature of property in Soviet society. The draft law is contrary to the Soviet nationalities policy; it does not give the worker the right to sell his own labor. The law has implications for wage levels. The USSR should learn from experience gained in other countries over long years of struggle. If the law does not adequately cover private property, there will be arbitrary rule by various officials as has been the case up to now. Autonomous regions of the country should have greater rights over property.

At 1612, Deputy Yudin says that the law does not pay enough attention to property rights over air space—responsibility for acid rain, or intellectual property. Numerically small peoples should be given rights of property over resources which are vitally important to their livelihoods.

At 1617, Deputy Volkov stressed the importance of the individual. Some property should be defined as belonging to the union as a whole and not to the individual republics where it is located.

At 1621, Deputy Fominykh supports the second version of Articles 24-25. Republics should be paid compensation for the stationing of armed forces on their territory.

1626 GMT

LD1710174989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1626 GMT on 17 Oct continues carrying a recorded relay of the 17 October Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Deputy Bunich suggests that the law on ownership should be adopted in the form of a framework law, with the details to be filled in later by the government and then presented for approval to the Supreme Soviet. The question of who should receive property in enterprises and land is a very difficult one. If some people have to pay for a lease while others receive property rights, this will also cause inequalities. Equal conditions should be created for all. He quotes Marx in praise of private property.

At 1637, Deputy Pogosyan says the law does not provide the necessary rights to autonomous territories and smaller peoples. The draft should be subjected to nationwide discussion.

At 1643, Deputy Sukhov says that priveleges should not be created for a minority. The opinion of the people must be consulted. There should not just be decisions taken on high and promoted by the media. There should be a referendum on new property laws.

At 1649, Deputy Petrushenko, in military uniform, warns that the introduction of private property might lead to the introduction of capitalism. the proposed system could lead to a new privileged class. Republics should have rights over their natural resources. the experience of Yugoslavia in interrepublican relations should be studied.

At 1656, Deputy Vorotnikov talks about the drafting of the law and the various opinions expressed. He discusses ways of constructively combining the various opinions. He agrees that there should be nationwide discussion.

At 1703, Deputy Arshba expresses his viewpoint on the effect of the law on autonomous territories and on Abkhaziya in particular.

1708 GMT

LD1710193989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1708 GMT on 17 Oct continues carrying a recorded relay of the 17 October Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Deputy Chernyshev discusses the philosophy of property. He criticizes various articles of the draft for their effect on the rights of various nationalities.

At 1714, Deputy Denisov criticizes social demagogy in general and Deputy Petrushenko in particular. Socialism means social justice which can be achieved in many different ways. He discusses the way the various forms of property can be used. He praises the regulatory role of the state sector.

At 1723, Deputy Aypin says that the law does not do enough for the autonomous territories nor to protect the environment. As it stands the draft is unacceptable to representatives of these territories.

At 1729, Deputy Ubaydullayeva expresses her point of view on the distribution of state property to the various republics. She details the problems of Uzbekistan which will require large investments to resolve.

At 1736, Deputy Sobchak praises the equality of various types of ownership as provided by the bill, also the variety of types of ownership. The economy is like a lady: it does not like force—no one form of ownership must be forced upon it. Natural riches should belong to the people living on the relevant land. Guarantees are an important issue: a citizen's right to land which he has acquired should be recognized. he calls for a special article to compensate owners for subsequent changes in laws to their detriment, and supports the setting up of a special editorial commission for the law.

At 1744, Deputy Sulakshin recalls work done in the economic reform committee regarding this bill and regrets the stereotyped ideas of socialism and capitalism contained in the bill. We should not fear private ownership: it should work for all, not just the shadow economy. Ownership of labor is a key issue. The Supreme Soviet should be more active in devising the wording of bills.

1752 GMT

LD1710195389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1752 GMT on 17 Oct continues carrying a recorded relay of the 17 October Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Lukyanov suggests continuing the discussion on his bill until 1300. He makes other procedural points and announces 20-minute interval.

At 1807, Isayev of the forestry commission expresses fears of an ecological catastrophe from destruction of forests, citing the problems of Brazil and Ethiopia. Forests must be used jointly, not divided up. They must belong to the people who live there. He calls for a national directorate to looks after the country's forests.

At 1817, Deputy Chernichenko urges the rapid introduction of the law, but criticizes some provisions, calling for guarantees to guard against the return of Stalinism. Air pollution results from the fact that nobody owns it. Soviets of people's deputies should be involved in ownership, as a guarantee.

At 1824, Deputy Medeubekov expresses his opinion of the bill, with specific reference to its effects on agriculture. He calls for more reasonable treatment of natural resources.

At 1830, Deputy Gadzhiyev voices fears that the rights of union republics are being infringed. Forms of ownership should not be confused with forms of economic management.

At 1834, Deputy Alksnis stressed the importance of the bill and refers to the Latvian People's Front's proposals on ownership.

At 1840, Deputy Boldyrev complains that the concepts of ownership and owners are being confused. He discussed various types of ownership.

At 1846, Deputy [Shapkayev] calls for recognition of the right of autonomous republics to ownership.

At 1848, Lukyanov asks whether the discussion should be continued or the issue put to the vote. A vote is taken to close the debate after two more speakers have had their say: 260 for, 154 against, 8 abstain.

At 1853, Deputy Dikhtyar expresses his view of the ownership issue; followed by Deputy Kugultinov, who talks about the essence of the concept "land".

At 1859, Lukyanov calls Ryzhkov to address the session.

At 1911, Lukyanov recalls that 32 deputies have spoken on the draft. He sums up the various proposals that have been made with regard to the draft. He reads out a composite proposal: to approve the first reading; to publish the draft for nationwide discussion; to set up a commission under Gorbachev to take account of the discussion; Supreme Soviet bodies to take part in the redrafting. He proposes accepting this as a basis.

At 1916, Arutyunyan approves nationwide discussion but proposes that the Supreme Soviet not "approve" but just present it to the public. There has been no drawing together of views during the discussion, she says.

At 1919, Lukyanov puts forward proposals on the work of the Supreme Soviet bodies on the draft and the various procedures. He puts the composite proposal to the vote; 302 for; 55 against; 36 abstentions.

At 1924, Deputy Bichkauskas questions the first point of the composite. He says Lithuanian voters will accept only a referendum.

At 1925, Lukyanov responds that there will be a nationwide discussion.

At 1926 other deputies make brief observations from the floor.

1932 GMT

LD1710210989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1932 GMT on 17 Oct continues carrying a recorded relay of the 17 October Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Deputy Alekseyev says that the present draft should be published for discussion, otherwise the matter will drag on and on.

At 1934, other procedural proposals are made from the floor.

At 1940, Lukyanov makes further procedural proposals. He calls for the closure of discussion to be put to the vote. Protests from the floor. 266 for; 85 against; 35 abstained.

At 1944, Lukyanov declares a recess. The vote will be taken after that.

At 1945, the evening session opens. Lukyanov hopes that emotions will have cooled. Registration shows 421 are present. During the interval work has continued on the proposal, says Lukyanov. He reads out the new draft proposal: to approve the first reading; to publish the draft law for nationwide discussion; to form a commission under Gorbachev with 22 members to draw up the new draft with participation of autonomous formations. He suggests putting this to the vote.

At 1951, Sakharov comments briefly. Lukyanov responds.

At 1953, a representative of the autonomous formations, Gadzhiyev, calls for their proposal to be voted on. Lukyanov reads out proposals on the wording of the property law. They can be discussed by the commission. Representatives of numerically small people complain that as they have no autonomous territory, they will be treated unequally.

At 2002, speakers from the floor say that the inhabitants of any particular area should have the right of property regardless of nationality.

At 2006, Lukyanov suggests putting the matter to the vote. More proposals come from the floor.

At 2022, Lukyanov puts the Khadzhiyev proposal to the vote: 125 for, 238 against. Lukyanov reads out the Alekseyev proposal and puts it to the vote: 276 for, 48 against, 35 abstentions. Vote to be rerun, because some deputies did not participate. Registration repeated: 426 present. Takes vote again: 309 for, 29 against, 34 abstentions. The Alekseyev proposal is adopted.

At 2030, Lukyanov moves on to discussion of a resolution on the trading and purchasing activities of cooperatives. Sobchak opens the debate. He reads out the resolution's restrictions on speculative dealings by cooperatives. He criticizes Shalayev for opposing the activities of cooperatives now, although he backed the law on cooperatives in the old Supreme Soviet. He adds explanations of each point of the draft resolution in turn.

At 2042, Lukyanov proposes that the draft be taken as a basis. Deputy Yanayev takes the floor and talks about the AUCCTU position on cooperatives. The trade unions consider good cooperatives to be an important element in the economy, but they are against speculative cooperatives. Yanayev proposes that the Sobchak draft be adopted, but rejects Sobchak's criticism of Shalayev.

At 2047, Lukyanov welcomes a group from the U.S. justice department, to applause. He then returns to discussion of the draft. Lukyanov calls for a vote on accepting the draft as a basis for further work: 390 for, 9 against, 4 abstentions. Lukyanov passes on to observations on each article.

At 2049, several deputies express their observations from the floor.

2056 GMT

LD1710222989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2056 GMT on 17 Oct continues carrying a recorded relay of the 17 October Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Lukyanov interjects, on speculation, that the anticrime committee will be discussing that very subject tomorrow.

At 2057, submissions from the floor continue. A deputy complains about the late availability of the draft under discussion. Exchanges between deputies and Lukyanov. Deputy Komarov makes a point about the nonprovision of compensation for speculative losses.

At 2104, Lukyanov invites further questions from the floor. A deputy asks why Deputy Tikhonov did not submit his question in writing to Deputy Sobchak. Why should speculation be given legal protection?

At 2107, Lukyanov makes the point that parliamentary time is expensive. Let's move on without wasting any more time, he says. Lukyanov puts Tikhonov's motion to the vote. A deputy defends the original version and says that it should stand. They will vote on Tikhonov's version first. Result: 77 for, 303 against, 20 abstained.

At 2110, a deputy makes a point about the text of one of the versions. Some discussion of this editorial matter follows. Two deputies then make a point about the prices that cooperatives should be allowed to charge for goods that have been imported: They should be comparable with home-produced goods of the same type.

At 2115, a deputy speaks about the procurement of agricultural produce and proposes a simplification of the wording this is supported by Lukyanov.

At 2117, another amendment is proposed, which is instantly accepted. Discussion of the possible separation of cooperatives' sources of supply from the wholesale network. A female deputy urges that cooperatives should not be allowed to buy up goods at retail prices. Discussion ensues about whether it is also necessary to forbid state enterprises to sell finished goods to cooperatives.

At 2123, Lukyanov spells out the voting possibilities if a vote is insisted upon. No one insists on voting on just one paragraph. Another female deputy makes a further point. Exchanges continue about whether the points made should be put to the vote.

At 2126 discussion continues on a further point from the floor—about the geographical aspect of speculation. Can goods be moved from one region to another? Answer: no, because certificates must be obtained for such transfers.

At 2129, Lukyanov wishes to move on to the vote, but another point is made from the floor. If the question of compensation for cooperatives arises, it must pass through a court, which will lock into all the relevant circumstances.

At 2132, Lukyanov starts to sum up the various amendments submitted in preparation for the vote. He puts the document to the vote. Result: 366 for, 15 against, 21 abstained. Should the names of who voted which way be published? Vote taken. Result: 156 for, 221 against, 16 abstained.

At 2137, Deputy Gritsenko proposes that approval should be given to a Supreme Soviet request for the Academy of Sciences to conduct a special conference to deal with specialized economic matters and to inform deputies of the results. Lukyanov asks if there are any objections to hearing the responses of acdemicians. There are no objections. Lukyanov wishes to put the request to the vote.

At 2147, more contributions are made. A deputy makes the point that economists hold different views. What conclusion can they possibly bring to the Supreme Soviet?

At 2149, a vote is taken: result; 300 for, 73 against, 18 abstained.

At 2151, Lukyanov says that many deputies have asked for the plenary session to be continued tomorrow. He puts the idea to the vote. Result: 345 for, 35 against. No abstention figure seen on the screen. The idea is that the morning session should be given over to discussion of the draft law on local government and local economy.

The recorded relay shows the session ending at 2153 GMT at which time the relay is concluded.

Petrushenko on Draft Law

LD1810014989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1649 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Speech by Deputy Nikolay Petrushenko from the recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 17 October at the Kremlin in Moscow]

[Excerpt] Esteemed comrades, continuing the debate on problems of ownership is in my view fundamental. Quite a few both constructive and—in my view—totally unacceptable proposals were voiced from this rostrum yesterday. Listening to the video recording of the parliamentary speeches yesterday evening I was distressed most of all by the ease with which—at times—our esteemed colleagues in the corps of deputies—approached the proposals regarding the dissolution of the union treaty and regarding private ownership.

I think that you will agree with me that in the conditions of a plurality of views such a formulation of the question is legitimate. Well, let's give a political assessment of the proposals being put forward.

After all, the question of ownership—as an esteemed deputy put it, if one says 'a' one must also say 'b'—is above all a question of power. And in the conditions where we have just started dismantling the administrative-bureaucratic system, where we have only taken the first step along the road of true people's power, where at last there is a glimmer of hope that public ownership, whose advantages are unquestionable and are being recognized even in the West, is about to have a chance to be realized, we are at the same time putting forward the idea of private ownership.

Today I think, words about private ownership based on one's own labor, provide no mask for us. [sentence as heard] But tomorrow, when the thousands of millions in the black economy and the mafia money will make it possible to make it dominant, will this not lead to a restoration of capitalism? Will the people support you, comrades deputies? And I would like to address those deputies who proposed this not as 'Comrade deputies' but as 'Mister deputies.'

Will we not be ashamed afterwards to remind one another that in conditions of a plurality of ownership there is also a plurality of power?

We are being persuaded that the people will support private ownership. Those people who think that the people will this time permit the latest experiment are profoundly mistaken. I think that the reaction to the cooperatives within this context has convinced you. Or do you think that the process of stratification, the process of enrichment of some and pauperization of others under private ownership will proceed at a slower rate?

In this connection it seems to me that the economic situation in the country is complicated. And the patient must be saved. But I think that if we recognize that we need our system as a whole, then we must treat this system which is suffering from a chronic ailment. That is to say, treat first of all public ownership and it is possible to cure it along the paths of democratization and full power of the people.

In this connection, however, alarm bells are ringing: No sooner have we proclaimed the slogan "Power to the People! Power to the Soviets" than now we already want to hand over this people's power and this power of the soviets to state ownership.

I think that things do not happen this way. And we know very well that in the conditions of the administrative system, the bureaucrat and the functionary, having brilliantly fastened onto property, was the person who was really in charge of it. The existence of this system of distribution of material benefits was precisely to his liking. He will be glad to be reborn now already legally, in the new capacity of a legal private proprietor, who has both material capital in the form of an apartment, a car, a country house, and non labor income. He will gain from the legalization of the black economy.

Well, let's ask the question: What after all will the working masses receive?

They will receive the right at first to sell their own labor more advantageously. Therefore I propose that the will of the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies be carried out and that the ban on the exploitation of man by man sould be enshrined not only in chapter one but also in chapter five which deals with forms and kinds of socialist [corrects himself], with forms of property. [passage omitted]

Vorotnikov Remarks

LD1810024189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1656 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Speech by Deputy Vitaliy Vorotnikov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Repblic Presidium, from the recording of the Supreme Soviet session on 17 October at the Kremlin in Moscow]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies, I fully agree with Comrade Kalmykov, who spoke yesterday, that the draft law on property, which is currently under discussion, is indeed of a crucial nature, and that the solution of both rest on a whole series of constitutional provisions which we shall be examining and a whole series of other laws—the law on land use, the law on economic and social problems connected with the interrelations between the union republics and our union government, and the law on local self-government and local economy, and so on—will depend to a great extent on the form taken by that law. It is, therefore, natural that this great importance of the draft gives rise, or rather has given rise, to such a broad and comprehensive discussion of it and to a nonuniform approach to a whole series of formualtions—both the composition of the commissions that handled the preparation of the draft and which have not so far come to a unified point of view, and in the speeches of many deputies today. That seems to me to be natural, and I think that it yet again confirms the importance of the question that we are today discussing.

However, it is necessary to reach a conclusion. It is necessary to come to some decision. It is said that the law has to be discussed for a further 2 or 3 months, and, at the same time, we know that it is desirable that it should be submitted already to the upcoming congress. In other words, it is necessary to try to finish off the work on it and adopt it during the remaining 40 or so days, and then such a version is possible. It, therefore, seems to me that we need, nevertheless, to think now about what constructive forms ought to be adopted so as to try to unify these different viewpoints; so as to elaborate some kind of approach; so as to avoid ultimatum-like demands here and to avoid, perhaps, the working out of the draft in excessive detail, but, at the same time, so that it should promote the consolidation of our society and the pooling of effort to which Comrade Alekseyev drew particular attention yesterday in his speech, which I found interesting.

I think that—and I, as a representative of the Russian Federation, have quite a few observations on the text of the draft—we probably need to make use of the tried-and-true form already, so as to set out in writing the observations that there are on specific articles and clauses. I should like to dwell on just one fundamental question and to express my attitude toward that question. It concerns Article 23, 24 and 25, which, by and large, define the ownership rights of the union and the union republic and the relations between them as regards the land, its depths, you understand, the forests there, the rivers, and so on.

I think that the proposals expressed here—as has been tabled in the second version of the draft—to the effect that relations should be built on contractual bases, on contractual principles, constitute a very controversial matter. It is necessary to take as our starting-point the actual situation, the actual state of affairs. It seems to me that, so far, the practice of setting up contractual conditions has not yet been properly mastered by us. And, all the more so when it is a matter of the mutual relations between a republic and the union, conflicts may arise here that will bring us to a dead-end situation; and especially, I think, since—and a number of deputies have spoken here about it—we cannot confine ourselves to going over from the diktat of the union to the diktat of the republics. What will happen to the autonomous formations—to the autonomous republics, the autonomous okrugs, the krays, and oblasts? Are we, then, in this draft to work out in thorough detail the legal norms relating to land, depths and other, as it were, property on behalf of these republics too and these autonomous formations? So we probably need some additional legislative enactments which, based on these provisions, which, perhaps, are indeed in the nature of a framework, as Comrade Bunich put it, but which are, at any rate, the main provisions connected with ownership, already spell out the further system of relations, because it's unlikely that we shall manage to put all the details, all the special features, and all the subtleties into the law. For that reason, I would consider that today's discussion, both yesterday's and today's, which will still continue, will make it possible to approach the draft from various aspects and from various standpoints and to express a whole series of proposals. Maybe we shall have to reach the decision that it can, all the same, be adopted as a basis, especially since I agree totally with those speakers who think that it must be submitted for nationwide discussion and that we must today instruct the government and the appropriate committees to carry out further work on the draft, bearing in mind today's discussion and yesterday's discussion, to submit it for discussion and then examine it article by article like the other drafts, and adopt it.

Denisov Speech

LD1810020289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1714 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Speech by Deputy Denisov, from the recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session on 17 October at the Kremlin in Moscow]

[Excerpt] Comrades, I have in my hands here the draft law on ownership officially adopted by the Committee on Ecology and Rational Use of Natural Resources, it was adopted fairly unanimously—with only one vote against. In relation to setting out this—I do not what to call it, perhaps an alternative draft law—I would like to express an opinion on the law submitted to us, this collective one.

Well, to begin with what is not fitting in it is a certain hypocrisy, I would say, social coquetry. After all, you understand at the start it says simply: socialist ownership is incompatible with the alienation of workers from the means of production and rules out the exploitation of man by man. And further it says the following: foreign organizations and citizens are entitled to own industrial and other enterprises on the territory of the USSR. How are we supposed to combine one with the other?

This means that a foreigner can own private property on our territory, whereas our citizen for some reason cannot. Why is it that foreigners should have such privileges? Why should they be given such rewards? And why such discrimination vis-a-vis Soviet citizens? Where's the logic here in all this? On the whole we are quite unable to rid ourselves of the passion for social demagoguery. The point is that neither socialism nor exploitation are inherent in state ownership or private ownership—nor vice versa.

Allow me to quote a communist, who is quite intelligent, in this connection: By themselves the forms of ownership—private or state ownership—the market, money, just as the forms of power—legislating power or the soviets—do not yet create either capitalism or socialism. They are essentially instruments, a vehicle. And the main thing this here is this: whoever—whether bourgeois or proletarian—is behind the wheel of this vehicle is who distributes the final product. This comrade, according to the terminology of Comrade Petrushenko, is Mr Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich. [applause] [passage omitted]

Ryzhkov Speech at 17 Oct Session

LD1710150889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Speech by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, at the conclusion of the 17 October Supreme Soviet debate on property in the Moscow Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] In my view, the USSR Supreme Soviet has approached an issue which will truly determine the development of our country and of our society for many years to come. And however great and significant the issues which the Supreme Soviet has discussed so far, for the most part their problems were nevertheless particular and definite ones. On the other hand, what we have been discussing since yesterday will determine both the face of our country and, I would say, the social structure of our state for decades.

In my view, the nature of this law is perhaps even more political than economic. Therefore I think that we must approach it from these positions. We must have a precise idea of what kind of state we envisage, how we shall see the state in 5 or 10 years, after half a century. That's our task. And it would seem that when we are adopting a definite decision today, we must look far, far into the future. But if we submit merely to the emotions which, unfortunately, urge us on in our everyday lives we might make very big mistakes. We must understand what kind of state we are really going to build—a strong, mighty state, a federal state—that's one line of discussion. But if we intend to create a confederation, that is a state or some separate states, then that's a totally different line of discussion. Therefore, I think that we must approach it from these positions. We must not make a mistake here. It's possible to be mistaken on some particular issue, you can be mistaken on a secondary issue because the results of these mistakes are not as significant as in a fundamental and definite document. In my view, therefore, we must take a very, very, very serious approach to these issues before adopting decisions.

I think those people were correct yesterday when they said in their speeches that we must now unite the efforts of everyone—the government, the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet, of all the Supreme Soviet deputies—to find correct and necessary decisions for our state and for our society's development. In our view, the great deal of work which was done in the commissions and committees on the examination and final revision of the draft submitted by the government has greatly enriched this law and, in my view, very many of the articles were precisely formulated and this gave us an opportunity to improve this law. At the same time, I should like to dwell on two issues of principle. I understand that reaction to them is very varied.

Many people oppose and support these issues, but I must state on behalf of the government; and also state my own personal opinion, however much it may please or displease some people. The first issue is private ownership. This issue has been aired both yesterday and today. Sometimes it has been aired camouflaged, through some rather imprecise formulations and so on. Whatever we might say and however we might formulate this problem, this issue, we must give a clear answer to this question, to this problem: are we in favor of private ownership or not?

This provides the basis. If we are in favor of private ownership, then let's say plainly we're in favor of private ownership, we are restoring ownership in our country, be it small-scale or big. But the fact that it's small-scale private ownership today, a workshop, say, isn't the point: tomorrow it will be a factory, and so on. For this is only the beginning. We convinced ourselves, we adopted a very good law on cooperatives, to great applause, it would appear. But in some places there were things that we failed to see, as they say, we did not think things through a long way ahead, and today we are adopting all manner of amendments to that law, because part of the cooperative movement say, did not go in the right direction. Here, too, therefore, we must think very seriously.

What is the position? We must not avoid this question. We must have a precise formulation. If we are against private conversations—and it seems to me that we are very naive in the way we approach ownership in the capitalist countries. Either we do indeed look at things in the context of the 19th century, or we do nevertheless live at the end of the 20th century. For private ownership properly runs through shareholding ownership—that is to say collective ownership—practically everywhere. We are also developing both collective and public ownership, and so on, ownership by labor collectives. Why do we today in putting forward a variety of forms of ownership, why do we consider that the potential of the person, the potential of society, cannot open up here? It seems to me that precisely these forms of ownership make it possible for us to bring out everything. So do we have to go along the line of private ownership today? On this, comrades, I say candidly: Have we, in general, asked the people then? The workers, have we asked them? Have we asked the peasants? Have we asked all of our 286 million-strong people whether they are in favor of private property or not? [indistinct remark from floor of hall] I think we...[interrupted by applause] I think we should think over these questions very seriously. We have to ask the people. This is a serious matter. It is a political issue, after all. If we go in this direction it seems to me that there can be some very serious social consequences.

The second question. The question of the ownership of the land, of minerals, of the shelves and so on, I won't repeat them all. It is a question of principle. In my view it is also of cornerstone importance—it is indeed the ownership of the land and the minerals that will in the future determine our condition as a state, of what kind the state will be. I understand it like this, that we have to create the kind of conditions so as to give our republics economic freedom in a proper way, so as to ensure that the republics use their rights correctly. I, for example, support this matter, because excessive centralization, which we have had in our country for decades, has now given in to its contradictions. It is very difficult to work in the country; it is very difficult to raise up the whole of the national economy. We must indeed have a situation in which the republics feel that they are the masters, but that they carry the responsibility accordingly. That is one part.

But there is a second part, for we have to think about what it is that should be uniting us. Today we cannot think only about separation, about separating the state. We must think about what unites. Apparently in addition to general theoretical research, against the general slogans, we must have economic relations which reflect to some extent the true reality of our state. We have talked the whole time about the national economic complex. This is indeed a most complex organism which it is impossible simply to cut off just like that. We would find ourselves in a very serious situation. It would seem to me, therefore, that we must think very seriously. The kind of formulation is not the point—the point is the subsance, how the country is going to live. If this law goes into force from 1991 it is written here that only relations under agreement... What is an agreement? What is an agreement? I could give dozens of examples of cases where one republic, say, will not want to deliver to other republics, and overall the entire country will suffer. Therefore, we must think seriously. Those proposals which were formulated by the government—it is clearly written there that this is union-republican—we'll call it republican-union ownership. In the final analysis, mutual relations are determined by the laws.

However, I have this doubt: We are saying, let's establish some kind of barriers against one another. That's what this is leading to. Each republic is to stand apart within its territory, as they say, within its own economy. Why don't we look in another direction? I personally believe that we have three or four propositions that—if we were to implement them as we need to do—would solve these issues. I understand that these issues are caused today by the abnormal situation in the country and in the country's economy. First, if there is to be a socialist market, who needs any barriers? If the country is to have a normal, socialist market, why do we need barriers? Why do we need any contracts? Why do we need any quotas? It will operate normally, so that any republic and any enterprise—regardless of its location—can sell and buy. But to this end, a socialist market has to be created. That, obviously, should be the main objective today.

Second is price reform, wholesale and procurement prices. Until we settle this matter, there will be the same old friction between the republics. What is cheap or expensive either in terms of the final product or of the initial raw materials. Therefore, we must tackle this matter.

Third, and more remote, although it would indeed help us to unite all our efforts, is the convertibility of the ruble. If we reach a situation in which the ruble is convertible, what difference does it make where we buy cotton, be it Uzbekistan or Egypt? What difference does it make where we buy our oil, Tyumen Oblast or Kuwait? So, if we look at it properly, there I think are the main guiding points to which we should pay attention and which should create precisely the prerequisites for the normal performance of the entire national economy. Yes, it's not something you can do in 2 years. Maybe 5 years will be needed, maybe 10. But that's the way we have to go. That is the normal way. Integration is underway today throughout the world. Everyone is joining together. Look at Western Europe. You know that in 1992 it is to remove all barriers altogether and create a single European market. Clearly, it is that direction that we should concentrate our efforts. Therefore, Comrades, in conclusion, my view is that the discussion has of course been very interesting and there are a great many proposals and today on the first reading it can, in my view, be accepted obviously only as a basis. In general, I support the proposal to set up a group...I don't know the composition of it...headed by Comrade Gorbachev, which would study once again all the official proposals, those voiced here, and would once again have a thorough look, as it were, at all the fundamental principles of this, the most important, law of our country.

TASS Summarizes 17 Oct Session

LD1710190289 Moscow TASS in English 1844 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

At a joint sitting of its two houses, the Soviet parliament today continued to debate the law on ownership, the fundamental law of economic reform.

The draft submitted before the parliament shatters many political and economic dogmas that have prevailed in the Soviet Union.

It stipulates that citizens can own the means of production to pursue individual and other kinds of economic activity.

It also grants farmers the right to inherit land leased on a termless basis and specifies joint-stock and other forms of ownership.

In the opinion of some deputies, however, the draft law is not radical enough.

Passions were running high on two issues: private property, the legalisation of which has strong support among some deputies, and who should be the owner of land and natural wealth.

The Supreme Soviet approved basic provisions of the draft law in the first reading and assigned a commission headed by Mikhail Gorbachev to edit and publish it for nationwide discussion.

In the afternoon, the Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution regulating intermediary trade activities of cooperatives, aimed to precent profiteering due to scarcities on the consumer market.

The parliament reaffirmed at the same time its unchanged policy towards promoting the cooperative movement.

The deputies greeted with applause the announcement by First Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov that American lawyers led by Attorney-General Richard Thornburgh were in the visitors' gallery.

Breaking with the usual practice of holding house sittings on Mondays and Tuesdays, the deputies decided to meet again tomorrow to speed up work on the draft law setting general principles of local self-management and local economy.

'Heated Debate' on Property Law

LD1710144589 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, the Kremlin, October 17 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Public attention is riveted to the Kremlin where the Supreme Soviet is discussing the first reading of the Law on Property Ownership.

The legislation is pivotal to Soviet economic reforms and will have a direct influence on the country's social system.

The draft submitted before the parliament in early October shatters many political and economic dogmas that have prevailed in the Soviet Union.

It stipulates that individuals can own the means of production to pursue independent economic activities.

It also grants family farms the right to inherit leased land and specifies joint-stock and other forms of property ownership.

However, some deputies do not consider it radical enough.

Passions are running high on two vital issues:

First, some deputies are pressing for the legislation of private property and want human labour to be considered a commodity. This will enable private owners to hire workers, they believe.

Secondly, a group of deputies, primarily from the Baltic republics, rejects the proposed form of ownership on land and natural resources. (The document envisages that land and resources will be joint property of the union and the union republic). They are pushing for republican ownership of land and natural resources.

In this heated debate, each side has its own arguments.

Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov presented the government's view on the issue today.

Commenting on the proposed restoration of private property, Ryzhkov said this was a special, political issue. It is necessary to know what all Soviet people think about it, he said.

Touching upon the differentiation between the union and republican property, the prime minister said it is necessary to determine the starting point: how do the deputies view the country's future—as a strong federation or a confederation of separate states.

It is vitally important to determine whose property the land and resources will become, since in the end this will determine the future of the Soviet state.

It is necesary to remove excessive central control of the country's economy and create conditions for the free development of union republics, he said.

Ryzhkov emphasised the links that hold the Soviet economy together.

The severance of these links spells serious consequences for the entire country, he warned.

Many deputies stressed the political implications behind the law on property ownership and support a nationwide discussion before its second reading in the parliament.

Radio Correspondents Report Deputies' Remarks

LD1710161789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] At the USSR Supreme Soviet session: Let's go over to our correspondents' unit in the Kremlin. Igor Zorin is at the microphone.

[Zorin] Hello, esteemed comrades. For the 2d day the deputies of our parliament are fixing their attention on the USSR draft law on ownership. More than 20 lawmakers have already spoken and even more have put their names down. This is natural when a fundamental law of our socialist society which is undergoing renewal is at issue. A search is underway for the optimal variant of both individual articles and of the whole law.

Most of the speakers are in favour of recognizing in the law the concept of the term private ownership, since this exists in our economy—in the shadow economy for the most part. So, the law must be used to turn its private ownership into a good thing. To do this it must be precisely determined who is the subject of ownership, what is the object, what type, and what are the guarantees of this ownership. This was the idea of Deputy Arutyunyan, for example.

Deputy Yudin said that the ownership bill did not specify who owned airspace, for example. It does not belong to anyone, as it were, and if there were acid rain through the fault of the landowner, he noted, then who was to answer for that? Deputy Sukhov, a worker from Kharkov, made an appeal that the adoption of an ownership law should not be hurried into without nationwide discussion. Petrushenko, a military deputy from Kazakhstan, noted that it is necessary to give a political appraisal of political ownership and that this would be the start of a dismantling of socialist values which had not revealed themselves because of the distortions during the era of Stalinism. And will the deputies understand us, mister deputies, he said, if we begin to restore capitalism?

Deputy Vorotnikov said that the law on ownership is of a pivotal nature and would determine the boundaries of submitting amendments and additions to the country's basic law. Deputy Chernyshev demanded final theoretical revision of the first article of the bill in particular, which is entitled 'The right to ownership in the USSR.' Deputy Denisov, a professor from Leningrad, was customarily bold in his idea that socialism is social justice, not the social demogogy which Deputy Petrushenko had displayed in what he had said about ownership. Comrade Denisov counterbalanced what Petrushenko said by quoting Lenin's idea about the role of private ownership in contemporary society. Deputy Aypin, a representative of the peoples of the north, believes that the bill on ownership does not take account of the rights of the autonomous formations.

As usual, Deputy Sobchak was listened to attentively. His main idea was that it should be registered in the law that land is the national property of the people living on it, and that there should be a guarantee of ownership for citizens; neither the make-up nor the quantity of property is restricted by anyone if it is acquired on legal bases. Sobchak also proposed, in particular, that a special editorial commission should be formed to monitor the promulgation of the law on ownership. He proposed that a commission should be created consisting of Comrades Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, Abalkin, Alekseyev, and Vologzhin.

Deputy Sulakshin, from the Economic Reform Committee, appeared very convincing to me. He proposed that the first reading of this draft should be approved and dispatched for nationwide discussion. He believes that many forms of ownership are provided for in the bill which should operate in economic reform. We should not be afraid of private ownership, Sulakshin noted, which—as I have been saying already too—flourishes in the shadow economy. Unfortunately, he noted, representatives of the higher echelons of authority have been bringing pressure to bear upon deputies' opinions during the elaboration of draft laws, and deputies remarks frequently reach the committee in a reduced form.

Then Comrade Lukyanov, who is chairing today's sitting, declared a break. After the break the debate resumed on the draft law on ownership. In particular, comrade Isayev noted that we must not be afraid of privately owning forests. Well, you know that he is the leader of the USSR timber department. Deputy Chernichenko and others also spoke. The debates are continuing, but I shall end my reportage here from the radio studio in the Kremlin.

Further on Discussion

LD1710132189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0930 GMT on 17 October carries a 10-minute report on the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Correspondent Andrey Nikiforov reports from the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet which is continuing its work today in joint session under the chairmanship of Lukyanov. Deputies continued discussion on the draft law on property, which in the opinion of almost all the deputies is the basis for all other documents which are to be examined by the session. To a great degree it is to form the basis for mutual relations between the union and the republics, between the republics themselves, between enterprises and organizations, and between people. It touches the economic, political and social aspects of life in Soviet society.

Nikiforov plays an excerpt from the speech of the day's first speaker, Deputy Arutyunyan. Arutyunyan says that the draft law has one serious failing: "I would like to talk about the fact that we do not recognize a person's right to sell his own labor; this is a negation of his value as a worker." He says that order in the wage and price systems and in the whole economy will only come about when this right of property is recognized.

Nikiforov then comments that Arutyanan's views may seem disputable. He says that the deputies' speeches have often been contradictory on this issue-which perhaps is how it should be. An expert from the speech by Pavel Bunich, a member of the Committee for Economic Reform, is played next. Bunich talks of the distribution of property: If property is to be distributed now, then there will be several undesirable consequences including the growth of inequality among people. There will be complaints about quality: some will be given Kuban land, some useless land in the Far East Bunich also states that land must be leased out. He concludes his speech by stating that 90 percent of the law should be approved and 10 percent of it should be changed.

The session is presently taking a break but will resume discussion of the draft law on property.

Decision Adopted on Cooperative Trading

LD1710182189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1656 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 17 Oct (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin.

The long discussion at the USSR Supreme Soviet as to whether or not there should be trading and purchasing cooperatives in the Soviet Union, which are regarded by a considerable part of the population as legitimized speculation, finally ended today. A decision was adopted which, together with the amendments approved yesterday to the law on cooperatives, on the one hand confirms the policy of developing healthy cooperation, and on the other hand is aimed at stopping abuse.

The document orders the cooperatives to cease trading and purchasing and intermediary activity from 1 January 1990.

In order that dishonest cooperative members should not use it for illegal gains in the more than 2 months that remain, from the day of its publication the decision introduces a ban on the sale to cooperatives by the state retail trade network of all goods that are in short supply on the consumer market.

Today's decision was adopted on the initiative of the trade union bodies and of a number of deputies who are concerned about serious distortions in the cooperative movement. During the discussion of the first variant of the draft decision some parliamentarians in the heat of the dispute suspected some of their colleagues of becoming a "cooperative lobby" and insisted on voting by names—for the first time in the history of the Soviet parliament.

But the fact that approximately 90 percent of those present in the auditorium voted for today's decision, indicates sufficiently eloquently that the Supreme Soviet is unanimous in its evaluation of the pluses and minuses of cooperation.

Further on Vote

LD1710163989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 17 October broadcasts a 7-minute report by Igor Zorin from the Kremlin on today's Supreme Soviet session. Zorin says that the preliminary draft of the law on ownership in the USSR is to be published for nationwide discussion in the press, and submitted for further refinement to a 22-person committee which includes Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, Abalkin, and the chairmen of all commissions and committees.

Sakharov suggests that all versions of the draft be published for discussion. Representatives of autonomous formations called for the draft to take into account ownership at the level of these formations, not merely union and union republic level, Zorin says.

Zorin notes that a number of deputies spoke on this motion proposing variations. Deputy Khadzhiyev spoke of the inalienable right of the autonomous republics, oblasts, and okrugs over land, water, the continental shelf, etc. Khadzhiyev called for a vote on the motion that all articles on ownership should take this into account.

Alekseyev, of the Legislation commission, felt there was no need for such a formulations, Zorin notes, saying that Alekseyev noted that it is a matter for the commissions. Lukyanov put this to the vote: 125 were in favor of Khadzhiyev's motion, with 238 against. Zorin says that as a result, the proposal regarding the ownership of the autonomous formations proposed by Alekseyev and seconded by Advadze duly went to the commissions.

Zorin says that deputy Gayer called for a review of the Geneva Convention on the property of small groups of people with state formations, and it was decided that the Council of Nationalities would look at this convention.

Zorin says: "Lukyanov put the matter to the vote as follows: To endorse the first reading of the basic clause of the proposed draft law on ownership in the USSR, taking into account the addenda and amendments of the deputies on reviewing the ownership of, say land, of the autonomous formations. In the voting 39 were in favor, 29 against, and 34 abstained." "Deputies from Lithuania, whose representatives left [word indistinct] did not take part in the vote since under the law of their union republic they did not have the right, or rather were not authorized to do so," Zorin adds.

Zorin says that consideration of the resolution on trading and purchasing activities by cooperatives has now begun. Sobchak is the rapporteur, Zorin adds. Some deputies comments have been taken into account, notably to ban cooperatives in the retail trade for resales of goods to cooperatives, and if trading and purchasing cooperatives sell their products in various areas, they are to take into account the maximum prices for those regions. The debate continues, Zorin concludes.

Political & Social

Georgian Fuel Shortages Reach 'Crisis' Level

PM1710225989 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 18 Oct 89 p 2

[Own correspondent N. Kvizhinadze dispatch: "Fuel Crisis"]

[Text] Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]—Filling stations present a dismal sight during these fall days in Tbilisi. Hundreds of cars waiting in line for gasoline. You have to take your place toward the end of the day, but there is no guarantee that you will be able to fill up within 24 hours.

The people waiting in line are extremely irritated. At the No 7 filling station on Kindzmaraulskaya Street one driver doused another with gasoline, the latter sustaining serious burns when the gasoline caught fire.

I have asked T. Koyav, deputy chairman of the republic State Committee for Fuel and Energy, to comment on the crisis situation concerning fuel:

"It is possible to speak of an emergency situation," he said. "Georgia has been on starvation rations for a month now. Around 35,000 tonnes of petroleum products are immobilized on the Azerbaijan Railroad. But that is not all, during the first 9 months of the current year the State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products has failed to supply us with more than 90,000 tonnes of gasoline and the Azerbaijan State Committee for Fuel and Energy with 16,000 tonnes. Together this approaches the republic's monthly requirement. A number of enterprises are on the brink of grinding to a halt because of the lack of bitumen [neftebitum], fuel oil, and lighting and diesel fuel. So far no improvement is in sight. The government of the country must adopt more resolute measures to bring about a normalization of the situation with the minimum delay."

Railroad Difficulties Affect Rostov Enterprises

PM1710152589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Oct 89 Second Edition p1

[TASS correspondent V. Bondarenko report for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA under the rubric "On the Main Transport Arteries": "Railcars at a Standstill"]

[Text] Rostov-na-Donu—Telegrams sent in recent days to the Rostov Oblast Grain Products Administration are like cries in the wilderness.

A telegram has been sent from Volgodonsk saying: "No flour of any kind in warehouses, railcars not dispatched to plants for many days. City bakeries under threat of closure."

"Collective of Proletarskiy Elevator Rice Mill reports: To date, mill has been out of action for 89 hours so 610 tonnes of rice not dispatched; due to lack of rolling stock, plan not being met for dispatch of mixed feed and food-grade wheat from Kirovskiy Elevator."

The desk of V. Voloshin, chief of the grain products administration transport department, is literally swamped with letters, telegrams, and telephone messages like these.

"The situation is becoming increasingly desperate," Voloshin did not conceal his concern. "Judge for yourself: In September because of the lack of railcars we failed to supply 28 of the country's industrial regions with 122,000 tonnes of grain and almost 7,000 tonnes of flour. We failed to dispatch foodstuffs to Donetsk, Voroshilovgrad, Voronezh, and Crimean Oblasts; we managed to get out just 5,000 tonnes of the promised 15,000 tonnes of grain to the Buryat Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (ASSR); just 3,000 tonnes of the promised 19,000 tonnes to Tyumen Oblast; just 1,000 of the promised 10,000 tonnes to the Udmurt ASSR; and only one-quarter of the planned 4,000 tonnes to Maritime Kray."

"Since the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted its well known resolution on the situation on the country's railroads, the state of affairs has been very slow to change," V. Tutikov, first deputy chief of the North Caucasus Railroad Administration, said. "Yes, railcars have gotten through to Armenia. But, to be more precise, they have gotten through and... are just standing there waiting to be unloaded. We now have absolutely no room for maneuver, we have no means of transportation for a very large region of the country. The number of railcars at a standstill in stations and the approach to stations is now somewhere in the region of 200. The mountains of freight awaiting dispatch in the loading and unloading bays of enterprises in the Don region are growing."

Armenian Party Discusses Unloading of Trains

NC1710142689 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 17 Oct 89

[From the KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN review]

[Text] The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee held a [word indistinct] consultation under the slogan "(?Priority attention) to railcar unloading." Oleg Lobov, second secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, chaired the consultation. Martirosyan, candidate member of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and chairman of the State Committee of People's Control; and Ghandilyan, head of the Yerevan branch of the Transcaucasian railway, spoke during the meeting.

Oleg Lobov drew the attention of the city and (?rayon) party secretaries and the chairmen of the executive committees of the local soviets to the need to reinforce party, political, and organizational work in unloading the railcars. Lobov said that it is necessary to draw young people and unused labor resources into unloading the freight and to organize the work into a number of shifts. [words indistinct] On this depends the speed of reconstruction in the disaster zone which was virtually stopped by the continued blockade of transportation with Armenia.

Government Accused of 'Exacerbating' NKAO Problem

NC1710134989 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 2130 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Report by Laura Baghdasaryan on a rally at Freedom Square in Yerevan; date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] The Karabakh Movement, the people of Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO], the earthquake, the blockade, the safety of Armenian soldiers, and dozens of other (?pressing) problems have confronted the Armenian people (?for 2 years now). [passage omitted]

Rafael Ghazaryan, corresponding member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences and people's deputy of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet spoke at the rally. He commented on criticism by informal organization representatives during a previous rally that the NKAO issue should not be presented to the central government as a demand by only the Artsakh Armenians. During the previous session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, Rafael Ghazaryan said, we very clearly explained our viewpoint on the NKAO issue. Unfortunately, some people, especially members of the former Supreme Soviet, did not understand us.

For 1 ½ years now, the central government has been trying to close the NKAO issue by (?intentionally) presenting it as a bone of contention between two neighboring republics—Armenia and Azerbaijan. However, the issue should not be closed. This is why we advanced the view tht during February of last year, the people of the NKAO solved the self-determination issue themselves—something dreamed of by everyone. The issue was solved by Artsakh in a constitutional atmosphere, through its supreme government body, through a decision of the oblast soviet. The Armenian and Soviet leaderships must now recognize this decision.

Artsakh, with its decision, placed the central government in a tight situation. This is why the central government slyly raised the issue of a bone of contention, with the aim of once again exacerbating the situation and thwarting the just demand of the people of Artsakh. When the Armenian Supreme Soviet decided that self-determination in the issue of joining the motherland was brought up by the NKAO itself, the central government was again placed in a tight spot. The central government once again set into motion, with all its might, the bureaucratic apparatus; and once again (?raised new voices) to suppress the Karabakh Movement. Two examples of the central government's shameful acts are the 18-month blockade of the NKAO and the 2-month blockade of Armenia. These blockades have created extreme tension in the two areas and have damaged their economies.

The rally called the blockade an inhuman and (?savage) act against the Armenian people. The time has come to [words indistinct]. Although the Soviet (?media) and certain television [word indistinct] programs try to hide the fact that the engineers of the blockade are the infamous leaders of the Azerbaijan ethnic front, no sensible peson can believe this false and (?distorted) news. (?No one can) present something called an ethnic front unless the great strength of the central government is involved.

During the rally, speeches were delivered by youths who had been discharged from the Soviet Army before the end of their service. They spoke of ethnic bias and inhumane behavior against Armenian soldiers. They demanded that no Armenian youth join the Army outside the borders of Armenia until guarantees for the security of Armenian soldiers are given.

The rally participants demanded that the postponed Armenian Supreme Soviet session be resumed.

These are difficult days in Armenia. Our open and hidden enemies hope to break the Armenian people's (?firm) determination through instigations against the people. But they are very mistaken. The Armenian people, who have (?been through so much), will again emerge victorious. Our future generation will see the holy objectives of the Armenian people fulfilled. Our victory lies in the unity of the homeland and the diaspora.

Dear compatriots, continue to stand firm with our motherland Armenia. Only by standing firm will defeat be impossible, no matter how strong the enemy may be.

ARMENPRESS Views Stepanakert Situation

PM1710110989 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 27 Sep 89 p 33

[Report by ARMENPRESS own correspondent A. Grigoryan: "Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast: Will They Heed the Voice of Truth?"]

[Text] Stepanakert—Will the voice of truth be heeded? On the day of the opening of the latest session of the USSR Supreme Soviet every Armenian in Nagorno-Karabakh is asking this question crucial to the fate of Artsakh [ancient name for area now known as Nagorno-Karabakh].

The decisions of the CPSU Central Committee nationalities plenum have unfortunately failed to justify the hopes of the overwhelming majority of the autonomous oblast's population. People here believe that the decisions have failed to shed light on the prospects for a just approach to an urgent problem. Paths of mutual understanding with the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic are also very limited, and this was convincingly shown by the recent session of the neighboring republic's supreme soviet. The speakers did not have a word to say about the extremely harsh conditions under which the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh are living, focusing their attention solely on the alleged plight of the autonomous oblast's Azerbaijani population. Moreover, the speeches of a number of deputies contained the idea that it is necessary to take measures making it possible to alter the demographic situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and to eliminate the republic's Shaumyanskiy (rural) Rayon bordering on the oblast and inhabited mainly by Armenians. The blockading of the district, which is continuing to this day, convinces us yet again that the words of the Azerbaijani side now are not at odds with their deeds. How long will the rights of the Armenian autonomous formation be flouted? Will the session of the country's Supreme Soviet be able to answer that question?

Meanwhile tension in the region is not easing. A stone war is continuing on the roads. Thus, near the settlement of Malibeyli, not far from Stepanakert, people of Azerbaijani nationality hurled stones at a KAMAZ truck belonging to the Martuninskiy Rayon winery. In Mardakertskiy Rayon, close to the settlement of Bashgyunefaya, an attack was made from a wooded area against five Armenian trucks on their way to the oblast center. Windshields were broken; there were no casualties. In the same rayon a road transport accident occurred.

In the settlement of Gasanabad, Askeranskiy Rayon, a dispute between groups of Armenians and Azerbaijanis turned into a fight. There have been other conflicts on an interethnic basis.

The delivery of food by helicopter to Stepanakert is continuing. From 1 September through to today over 250 tonnes of flour and many types of vitally important freight have been airlifted to the city.

Azerbaijan Draft Law on Sovereignty Outlined

90US0067A Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 17 Sep 89 p 1

[Draft Constitutional Law of the Azerbaijan SSR "On the Sovereignty of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic"]

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, proceeding from the right of all people to self-determination, on the basis of the freely expressed will of the people of the republic, has united with other Soviet republics into one state, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the principles of equal rights and preservation of its sovereignty.

The status of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] within the Union of the SSR is determined by the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR which plenipotentiary representatives of Azerbaijan signed in 1922 and the final text of which became a part of the 1924 USSR Constitution.

Conditions for the stay of the Azerbaijan SSR within the Union of SSR laid down in the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR cannot be revised without its consent.

The Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan SSR:

—proceeding from the inalienable right of all peoples to determine their fate freely and independently;

—being aware that only the free unification of Soviet nations enjoying equal rights within the framework of a socialist federation guarantees their comprehensive development;

—being aware of the urgent need to cleanse mutual relations in the union of various kinds of deformations which have emerged as a result of departing from Lenin's concept of the Soviet union state;

—being guided by the main principles proclaimed in the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR and the provision of the Constitution in effect on the sovereignty of a union republic;

—considering it necessary to bring the legislation of the Azerbaijan SSR into compliance with its status as a sovereign republic within the Union of SSR,

—adopts the present constitutional law.

1. The Azerbaijan SSR is a sovereign socialist state within the Union of SSR. All power in the republic belongs to the people and derives from the people. The people exercise state power both directly and through the soviets of people's deputies which are the political foundation of the Azerbaijan SSR.

The sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR is expressed through the independent exercise of the supreme legislative, executive, and judicial power by the Azerbaijan SSR in its entire territory in the interests of the entire multi-national people of the republic.

2. Mutual relations between the Azerbaijan SSR and the Union of SSR, and the union republics are developed on a treaty basis the fundamental principles of which are the voluntary stay of union republics in the Union of SSR, their equal rights, mutual respect for sovereign rights, territorial inviolability and integrity, and independent socio-economic development within the union state.

Any legislative act envisaging a change in the constitutional and legal status of the Azerbaijan SSR as determined by the Treaty on the Formation of the SSR may only be adopted with the consent of the Azerbaijan SSR.

3. The Azerbaijan SSR is entitled to resolve all issues associated with the political, economic, and socio-cultural development of the republic and its administrative and territorial division. Any interference in resolving the issues which are an inalienable right of the Azerbaijan SSR should be regarded as a violation of its sovereign rights.

4. The jurisdiction of the Azerbaijan SSR is limited only with regard to issues which have been voluntarily delegated by the republic itself to the Union of SSR.

5. The sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR extends to the entire territory of the republic including the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and the NKAO [Nagorno- Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] which are an inalienable part of Azerbaijan.

The territory of the Azerbaijan SSR is indivisible, inalienable, and cannot be changed without its consent as expressed by an all-people's vote (referendum) held by a decision of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet among the entire population of the republic.

Borders between the Azerbaijan SSR and other union republics may be changed only by the mutual consent of appropriate union republics.

6. Laws of the Azerbaijan SSR and USSR laws which do not infringe on the sovereign rights of the Azerbaijan SSR are in effect in the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR.

5. The Azerbaijan SSR has the right to freely leave the Union of SSR. This right is exercised by the will of the people of the republic through a referendum held by a decision of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet.

The protection of sovereign rights of the Azerbaijan SSR is provided by the Union of SSR and the Azerbaijan SSR.

8. In the interests of defending the Azerbaijan SSR, its sovereignty, and safety of its citizens, the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan SSR may impose the state of emergency in the entire republic or in its individual areas with special forms of government being introduced which are carried out by the state organs of the Azerbaijan SSR.

9. The Azerbaijan SSR participates in resolving issues falling within the jurisdiction of the Union of SSR in the supreme organs of state power and governance of the USSR. This right is guaranteed by ensuring the representation of the Azerbaijan SSR in the organs of state power and governance of the Union on an equal footing with other union republics, ruling out special privileges and advantages for individual republics.

10. The land, its mineral wealth, forests, waters, and other natural resources of the Azerbaijan SSR constitute the national wealth and state property of the republic and belong to the people of Azerbaijan.

The people of the Azerbaijan SSR as represented by its supreme organs of state power and governance have an inalienable right to manage the natural and material-technical resources of the republic.

Procedures for the use and exploitation of natural resources located within the republic territory are established by the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet.

11. The Azerbaijan SSR carries out measures aimed at ensuring the economic independence of the republic. The Azerbaijan SSR ensures comprehensive economic, social, and cultural development in its territory and exercises control over the operations of all enterprises, offices, and organizations located in the territory of the republic.

12. The following are within the jurisdiction of the Azerbaijan SSR as represented by its supreme organs of state power and governance:
1) adopting and amending the Constitution of the Azerbaijan SSR,
2) control over compliance with the Azerbaijan SSR Constitution and ensuring the conformity of the Nakhichevan SSR Constitution to the Azerbaijan SSR Constitution;
3) forming and abolishing autonomous republics and oblasts within the Azerbaijan SSR;
4) legislation of the Azerbaijan SSR;
5) protection of the sovereignty of the republic, state order, rights and freedoms of citizens;
6) establishing procedures for the organization and operation of supreme and local organs of state power and governance;
7) implementing a unified socio-economic policy, managing the economy of the Azerbaijan SSR; carrying out measures aimed at the rational utilization and protection of natural resources;
8) developing and adopting state plans of economic and social development of the Azerbaijan SSR, state budget of the Azerbaijan SSR, and adopting reports on their execution; supervising the implementation of the state budget of the Nakhichevan ASSR, budgets of the NKAO, rayons, and cities reporting to the republic;
9) establishing control over the operations of finance and credit establishments, proceeds taken in by the the state budget of the Azerbaijan SSR and the state budget of the USSR;
10) managing all sectors of the national economy of the republic;
11) establishing procedures for utilizing the land, mineral wealth, forests, and waters; protecting the natural environment;
12) protecting cultural and natural landmarks; granting academic ranks and titles, awarding orders and medals of the Azerbaijan SSR;
13) managing internal affairs and state security organs;
14) forming the Committee for Constitutional Supervision and other judicial organs of the republic, determining their jurisdiction and procedures for their work;
15) amnesty and pardon for citizens convicted by the courts of the Azerbaijan SSR;
16) managing political, economic, scientific, and cultural ties with foreign countries;
17) representing the republic in international relations;
18) resolving other republic-level issues.

13. The Azeri language is the state language of the Azerbaijan SSR. The Azerbaijan SSR shows state concern for the comprehensive development of the Azeri language and the languages of peoples residing in the

territory of the Azerbaijan SSR, their progressive national customs and traditions.

The Azerbaijan SSR ensures the use of the Azeri language in state and social organs, cultural and educational establishments, and others, and shows state concern for its comprehensive development.

The Azerbaijan SSR ensures the free use and development of the Russian and other languages of the population which it uses.

14. The Azerbaijan SSR has a right to enter into direct relations with foreign states, sign treaties with them, and exchange diplomatic and consular representatives, and participate in the activities of international organizations.

15. The Azerbaijan SSR possesses all the attributes of a sovereign state. The symbols of state sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR—the flag, the seal, and the anthem—are sacred, and any desecration of them is punishable by law.

Citizen Proposals Arrive at Tajik Party Plenum

LD1710120989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2330 GMT 16 Oct 89

[Text] The first proposals from inhabitants of the indigenous nationality and nonindigenous nationalities of Tajikistan have arrived at the routine plenum of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee. They contain calls to develop relations, and to end the unjustified emigration of specialists from the republic. On the agenda of the upcoming forum is an item on practical measures to implement the CPSU platform "The Nationality Policy of the Party in Contemporary Conditions." This is a topical theme for the multiethnic kray, and so the party bodies and the public are searching for new paths for interethnic accord; one of these is a nationwide [vsenarodnyy] appeal by the Tajik intelligentsia to the inhabitants of the republic.

Tajik Language Law Adds Penalties

18300855 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 7 Oct 89 p 3

[TadzhikTA-TASS report: "Guarantee of Equal Rights for Languages"]

[Text] Dushanbe, 5 October—A law supplementing the criminal code of the Tajik SSR with a new article, 141.1, has been published here. It provides punitive measures for violating the equal rights of languages.

This supplement came about as a logical continuation in implementing the republic's recently adopted Tajik Law on Language, Article 35 in particular. It says that violating the equal rights of languages as expressed by hostile relations toward a given national language, by degradation of the honor and worth of citizens for linguistic motives, by the artificial creation of obstacles and restrictions in the use of languages, or by the limitation of constitutional rights of citizens will carry consequences, including even criminal consequences.

This legislative act is intended to warn people against manifestations of nationalism. For example, violation of Article 141.1 is punishable by correctional labor for a term of up to 2 years or a large-scale fine, while repeat violations are punishable by deprivation of freedom up to 5 years or a large fine.

Tajik Court Convicts for Anti-Russian Slur

18300824 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 19 Aug 89 p 4

[Article by A. Islyamov, LENINABADSKAYA PRAVDA special correspondent (article is reprinted from LENINABADSKAYA PRAVDA, 11 Aug 89): "A Case Chronology"]

[Text] **There was heightened interest in this judicial panel session of the oblast criminal court. For two days the assembly hall of the Kanibadam Brake Works Plant could hardly accommodate all those desiring to attend the trial of I.S. Makhmudov, accused of criminal offense under Article 71, Part I, of the Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Criminal Code.**

On the morning of 23 April this year, several Kanibadam residents, later called to appear as trial witnesses, were literally shocked to see three homemade signs hanging on Lenin Street with nationalist slogans. The signs spoke for themselves: "Get the Russians," "Beat the Russians..."

We must give credit to the Kanibadam detachment, the oblast KGB, and the internal affairs section of the gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee], which identified the author of these signs right away. It turned out to be Ilkhom Salidzhanovich Makhmudov, a native of Kanibadam born in 1966, a Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] member with secondary technical education, a machine operator in the first shop section of the brake works plant.

From materials of the court proceedings: "I, Ilkhom Makhmudov, fully agree with the charge I am presented with under Article 71, Part I, of the Tajik SSR Criminal Code, and plead guilty. On the evening of 19 April, a couple of European fellows I did not know stopped me and asked for a light. I replied that I do not smoke and proceeded on my way. But one of these guys struck me on the head from behind. As I was falling down, they kicked me in the legs several times, then ran away and hid. I went home, and about one hour later went to work for my night shift."

"After work on the morning of 20 April I went to a store and bought a small bottle of blue ink. Then at home I used a drafting pen to write slogans on poster sheets, two in Tajik and one in Russian."

"At 10:30 the night of 22 April, on my way to work for the third shift, I hung two posters on the wall of the

Culture and Recreation Park near the Guliston bus stop and the third on the soccer bulletin board. Then I went to work."

The motive for making up these nationalist posters would seem to be clear—the man was beat up, harbored a grudge, and was intent on vengeance. However, the testimony of medical experts based on an examination conducted the first few days of May reveals the absence of any trace of injury to Makhmudov's head or body...

From the court deposition of witness A. Glagolev: "I do not know the accused. On the morning of 23 April I was on my motorcycle to go fishing when I saw a poster 50 by 50 cm in size on the bulletin board. It had a slogan calling for getting rid of the Russians. I took the poster down and went to the police..."

Asked at his trial why he had not gone to the police after being beat up, Makhmudov replied there was no way the police would be able to locate the fellows who had done it.

From the court deposition of witness N. Mamadov: "As a shop inspector, I was a member of a special team assigned to check activities at the city marketplace. There I met gorispolkom employee I. Abdullayev, who informed me that posters with nationalist slogans were hanging at the Guliston bus stop. He also informed A. Khaydarov, chairman of the city Committee of People's Control. Khaydarov told me to remove the posters and take them to the police..."

From the court deposition of witness D. Chistyakovaya: "I was on my way to work on the city bus and saw these posters from the window. I notified the police when I arrived at my job at the Dusti department store."

From materials of the court proceedings: "Witness G. Dzhurayev, a sales clerk at the 'Camera Equipment' store, was identified 7 May 1989 by I. Makhmudov as the individual from whom the accused bought the blue ink." It was the conclusion of handwriting and linguistic-sociological experts that all three posters were made by I. Makhmudov and contained slogans intended to incite national dissension and demean the national pride and dignity of other nationalities.

Makhmudov's guilt with respect to the foregoing charge is also proven by court depositions of other witnesses, by recorded videotape of testimony verification at the scene of the crime, and by other criminal record materials.

Sentence of the court: "In the name of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic...the judicial panel of Leninabad Oblast Criminal Court, having studied the materials of criminal proceedings, interrogated witnesses, and listened to the case of the accused, finds I.S. Makhmudov guilty as charged of criminal activity under Article 71, Part I, of the Tajik SSR Criminal Code 'On Violating Equal Rights on the Basis of Nationality and Race,' and imposes upon him a fine in the amount of 1000 (one thousand) rubles."

Commentary. "We must say—this is just about the first time in the history of Tajik legal proceedings that we have had a conviction under Article 71," states M. Madazimov, deputy chairman of the oblast court. "What guided the actions of the court in the examination of this matter? The frank confession and remorse shown by Makhmudov, in addition to his youth, were primary considerations in rendering this judgment. The accused was characterized by comrades at work and by his superiors in exclusively positive terms. In fact, it was difficult for them to understand that he could have done it at all."

"Taking everything into consideration, it was apparent that Makhmudov had made up these signs under the influence of a short-lived personal offense. His actions involved no strong, premeditated expression of nationalist sentiment. But no one has the right to transgress the law, no matter who he might be. I believe we made the proper determination of punishment in this case," Madazimov continued.

"I would like to stress once again that this is the first instance in the history of our republic where Article 71 has been applied, and I hope it is the last. We had a discussion with the brake works plant collective immediately following the court proceedings..."

Editorial Note: We recall that what happened in Kanibadam is not the one and only incident with this kind of nationalist bent. Our newspaper recently reported a fight among teenagers the night of 20 July which led to rioting. An urgent call had to be issued summoning a unit of the patrol-guard service and a criminal case was opened. Such instances are the result of hitches in the political education process, specifically in our efforts to conduct international and patriotic education for our young people. Party and soviet organs, the Komsomol gorkom, and social organizations should change their attitudes towards the upbringing of our younger generation, and should take more decisive measures in attempting to avert such occurrences.

Philological Society Founded in Tajikistan

LD1410131289 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] Tajikistan, a Soviet republic in Central Asia, has set up a philological society. The new public organization held its founding congress in the Tajik capital today. Its major goal is to contribute to the quickest and most effective implementation of the bill on languages passed by the local legislature. The bill grants Tajik the status of official language.

Upcoming Elections in Kazakhstan Reported

LD1710165489 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Alma-Ata October 17 TASS—By TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulagin:

The nomination of candidates to local soviets have begun in Kazakhstan. The elections are scheduled for December, earlier than in the other republics, because an extraordinary session of the Kazakh Supreme Soviet has revised the elections law, transferring them to an earlier date.

According to the law, the total number of deputies in the republic has been slashed by one-third on the average. Any number of people can now run for elections. Candidates who fail to get the required number of votes are dropped from the elections.

In addition to working collectives, public organisations, public meetings and military units, the right to nominate candidates is now enjoyed by students of higher and special educational establishments. Candidates from public organisations run for election on an equal footing with all others.

The electorate is making good use of the broader rights they have received under the new law. People of different walks of life and nationalities are being nominated. For instance, a meeting at the "Zarechny" state farm discussed the candidacy of Nikolay Faustov, a Russian, who heads a team of vegetable growers, and Seyfudin Khamkhoyev, an Ingush and the farm's chief engineer. The latter was voted candidate.

The first candidates include many workers. A plenary meeting of the Krasnoarmeysk District Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan nominated Aleksandr Guzev for elections to the regional soviet. Aleksandr Guzen is a tractor team leader. An electoral meeting in Alekseyevka nominated building a team-leader Aleksandr Ilyin for the same elections.

A Kazakh shepherd of the Lenin State Farm Shalkar Musayeva, Valentina Kasparyan, a Russian worker of the "Chiliksky" farm, Nuradin Aliyev, an Azerbaijanian brigadier of the "Issyuk" farm, and Svetlana Khaleva, a Kazakh spinner of the Kargalinsk worsted wool complex, are among the first candidates to the Alma-Ata regional soviet.

The first electoral meetings are over. There is a long election campaign ahead.

Drug Trafficking on Rise in Kazakhstan

LD1510214189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 15 October in its "Vremya" newscast carries a Nugmanovaya video report on a drug interdiction operation in Kazakhstan.

The report begins showing vehicles being checked and plastic bags containing a white substance. Nugmanovaya says: "This is the Chu Valley. Drug runners throng here from all over the country. They take various routes using the railroads, hitchhiking, and riding in their own cars and even in cars belonging to their employers. They are obviously attracted by the comparative accessibility of the drugs and the opportunity to obtain large sums of money for them. I am not just saying this for the sake of saying it. All the roads have been reliably closed off here and the militia and state vehicle inspectorate are on duty around the clock."

Nugmanovaya says that during the time she spent with the militia about a dozen people were detained for having drugs in their possession. She adds that the drug runners are "mobile and technically well-equipped which is something which cannot always be said of the militia."

The video then shows an interview with an individual identified by caption as V.F. Gorelkin, chief of the Criminal Investigation Directorate of the Kazakhstan Soviet Socialist Republic Internal Affairs Ministry. Gorelkin says that "the striking thing about this operation is that these people are armed. They are armed criminals. They are armed both with guns and other offensive weapons. Whereas previously about two or three cases in ten involved weapons, the reverse is now the case. There are eight or nine cases involving weapons for every one which does not. These people also use state transport. That is another special feature this year. In other words, the control exercised by managers of enterprises has been reduced and all this happens on the weekend." Gomulkin adds that most of the people involved are under 30 years of age and laments their lost lives.

Nugmanovaya closes: "Here is a worrying statistic. The number of people abusing drugs is growing. Whereas 7 years ago the figure for Kazakhstan was 3,000 people, it is now over 10,000."

Victimization of Uzbek Servicemen Disproved

*PM1710105389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3*

[Correspondent V. Artemenko report under the rubric "From the Latest Mailbag": "Against Lies"]

[Text] Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic—Rumors have been earnestly circulating in Uzbekistan recently that representatives of other nationalities in military units have supposedly been exacting vengeance on Uzbeks for last summer's tragic events in Fergana Oblast.

In order to determine the true state of affairs and cast light on some events, a delegation from the editorial offices of the oblast newspapers FERGANSKAYA PRAVDA and KOMMUNA visited the oblast's cities and rayons. In addition to journalists, the team included leaders of the oblast military commissariat and Communist Youth League officials.

The editorial office delegation conducted extensive and detailed investigations. Their results were published in a special supplement of the two newspapers (in both the Russian and Uzbek language): "The Army Is the Flesh and Blood of the People. We All Must Think About It."

The team reached the conclusion that many instances of violations of military discipline and cases of servicemen being killed or dying have on several recent occasions been represented by some citizens as consequences of the Fergana events. Spiteful persons are trying to give them their own interpretation and to sow panic among young people and their parents and to groundlessly contest conclusions by military medical institutions, prosecutor's offices, tribunals, and other state institutions.

In actual fact, having analyzed all the facts, the editorial office delegation discovered that the situation is completely different. Here are some facts by way of example. Young conscripts from Fergana Oblast committed 129 breaches of military discipline last year, 110 of them being by representatives of the local ethnic group. The figures for this year so far stand at 89 and 57 respectively.

The newspapers convincingly refute conjectures about alleged killing and maltreatment of Uzbek boys in the army. For example, B. Abdurakhmanov, a native of Frunzenskiy Rayon, died in a military unit stationed in Kazakhstan. "When the body of the deceased was brought home," M. Yusupov, chairman of the War and Labor Veterans Council on the "Kommunizm" State Farm and a relative of deceased, recounted, "some unknown persons, introducing themselves as members of the 'Birlik' informal organization, tried to convince me that the soldier had supposedly not died of natural causes but had been killed."

Accompanied by a group of senior rayon officials, M. Yusupov traveled to the place where B. Abdurakhmanov had served. Fergana Oblast representatives told the newspapers that, during their visit to the military unit, they were convinced that their fellow-countryman had died from an illness. They met soldiers of Uzbek nationality and were convinced that they serve there on an equal footing with all the rest.

The newspapers also cite another fact. Private O. Goipov, who lived on Tashlakskiy Rayon's "Kommuna" Collective Farm prior to being called up, wrote home a letter saying that he was being beaten up by Meskhetian Turks in his unit. An inspection revealed that Goipov had invented everything in order to secure his discharge and return home. And now he has had to publicly repent.

The newspapers cite convincing facts and documents to prove the inconsistency of the lies. "It is necessary," the journalists conclude, "for all honest people to join the work on refuting the false rumors, gossip, and barbs about alleged cases of persons of Uzbek nationality being victimized in the Army."

The editorial office delegation revealed in the special supplement the causes and raised a series of serious problems concerning the training of young people of predraft and draft age for military service. These are primarily poor general education standards of conscripts, inadequate knowledge of the Russian language, lack of useful interests, and a narrow outlook.

FERGANSKAYA PRAVDA and KOMMUNA have given space in their special supplement to Oblast Military Commissar N. Boychenko. He speaks at length and with concern about the problems of military service and describes what the oblast's military commissariats are doing to train worthy replacements of Uzbek soldiers in the Soviet Army.

Chimkent Officials' Trial Opens

PM1310090789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by own correspondent G. Shipitko: "Accused of Bribery"]

[Text] Frunze—The trial of A. Askarov, former first secretary of the Chimkent Oblast Kazakh Communist Party Committee, has begun in Frunze. He and another six accused, including former officials of the oblast's party committees and law enforcement and economic organs, are charged under articles 146 and 147, parts two, of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Criminal Code and article 173 part two of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic criminal code. There are about 300 witnesses to the case, in which the charges alone fill four volumes.

In 1978-1985 A. Askarov headed one of Kazakhstan's largest party organizations. In the summer of 1985, by a decision of the republic Communist Party Central Committee bureau, he was relieved of his work for various violations of the norms of party ethics, abuses, and "bribe taking and protectionism." In early 1987, while he was on a personal pension, A. Askarov was arrested in connection with a sensational case involving bribes given to A. Karavayev, former Kazakh minister of automotive transport. For 2 and ½ years the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigated A. Askarov's case.

The first court sitting opened under the chairmanship of N. Ibragimova, member of the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Court. The day before she said in an interview with our correspondent:

"It is not a simple case, and it requires comprehensive proof from the prosecution in the courtroom. The first difficulties have already arisen. Four lawyers refused for various reasons to take part in the trial. And new lawyers are presenting the defense. Time is needed for them to prepare very carefully for the trial. It is obviously with a consideration for that factor that after the trial has opened the actual hearing of the case will have to be deferred."

"Why is the trial taking place in Kirghizia and not in Kazakhstan, where the accused lived and worked?"

"The USSR Supreme Court, through its decision, appointed the republic's Supreme Court responsible for holding the trial. We decided where to hold the trial itself. We chose Frunze City, believing that it would be more convenient for the court there. In addition it will be far less distance for witnesses to travel to the trial from Chimkent, and I believe there will be more objectivity."

The state charges in the case of A. Askarov and the others are supported by representatives of the prosecutor's offices of the USSR, the Kazakh SSR, and Krasnodar Kray. Under the articles cited the accused face prison terms of up to 15 years.

The first session of the court was held 11 October. It was decided that the next session will be transferred to 11 December. Why? In connection with altered circumstances. As soon as new representatives for the defense have studied all 76 volumes of the criminal case, the court will resume its work.

Opinion Poll Criticizes Ukraine's Shevchenko

LD1810090989 Kiev in English to North America 0030 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Some of the electors assess lowly the work done by the USSR people's deputies from Ukraine. For example, the recently held public opinion poll, sponsored by the Soviet weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, showed that certain deputies from Ukraine have been sharply criticized. This in particular concerns Valentina Shevchenko, USSR people's deputy, chairman of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Here is what she said about this poll:

This is quite natural. Now they criticize me in Ukraine probably sharper than ever before because many of those who criticize believe that all our difficulties are due to the present-day leadership, including myself as chairman of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet Presidium. And this is not quite so. And this is not our fault that the state mechanism is very complicated and interrelated. Some people believe that we do not apply enough efforts to defend interest of the republic, continues Valentina Shevchenko. Some people believe that perestroyka in Ukraine is moving on at very slow rate. Personally, I cannot agree with such an assessment.

Indeed, perestroyka is progressing slowly. But we do not do what we are actually able to do. However, over the 4 years the plans of housing construction have been overfulfilled. Also overfulfilled have been the plans for the construction of schools, day care centers, hospitals, community centers. In a word, we now pay special attention to social sphere, said Valentina Shevchenko.

Ukrainian Draft Election Law Scrutinized

LD1510175889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Oct 89

[A. Lyaskalo video report from Kiev, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Lyaskalo] I would say that yesterday, today, and this weekend, have been days of high political activity in the Ukrainian capital. A meeting of the deputies' club is in progress in the assembly hall of the polytechnical institute. The voters have been invited. The results of 2 months of widespread national discussion of the draft law on elections to the republic and local soviets are being reviewed. In a week's time this law will be adopted by a session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine.

[People's Deputy P. M. Talunchuk, as identified by video caption] You know that on the initiative of a group of people's deputies an alternative version of the law was elaborated here in the Ukraine. Well, let's say straight out that at the start members of the apparatus were adamantly opposed to it. However, gradual work in discussing it has led to a point where agreement has been reached on several serious issues, an alternative version to be precise.

The point is, first and foremost, that there should be contested [alternativnyy] elections. There should not be elections from public organizations. That is, they can nominate their candidates, but voting should be based on territorial constituencies. There are several other such democratic points laid down in this law.

[Lyaskalo] The law is the most immediate task, but what about the long term?

[Talanchuk] That is certainly the case, but as I see it, the long-term task of the club is to consolidate the healthy forces of our republic. What we need are carefully considered decisions which should determine reliable prospects for the development of our society, without excesses and without extremism but on a healthy and principled basis.

[The video report continues showing demonstrators carrying placards bearing slogans such as "No to price rises," "24 days annual vacation," "No to price rises and empty shelves."]

[Lyaskalo] At the same time, the people of Kiev were gathering on the slopes of the Dnepr for a big meeting. This meeting was organized by the city Soviet of Trade Unions at the request of the trade union organizations of several factories. As you can see, the slogans are simple and topical and the main thing is that they call for decisive action. [passage omitted]

Ukrainian Party Chief Ivashko on Mass Media

90UN0066A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 12 Oct 89 p 1

[Report on interview with Ukrainian First Secretary A. Ivashko, by SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent in Kiev O. Gusev: "Who Gets the Interview First?"]

[Text] Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, the recently elected first secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, has met with correspondents of local and central newspapers.

Speaking of preparations for the 28th congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, V. Ivashko accented the need for renewal and for improving the health of work in all party organizations. In the renewed party, he emphasized, there is no room for an "iron hierarchy" or servility. The first secretary devoted much time to questions of glasnost and the problems of journalists' work under present conditions.

"The situation in society is changing very dynamically," V. Ivashko said. "Today no set of instructions can orient a journalist on the changes that go on in our lives. The journalist must begin with these realities, and not from stereotypes, whatever they might be, old or new. If we do not want to push our republic and country off the cliff with nonconstructive criticism and confrontation in society, then let us concentrate our efforts on solutions to questions of renewal of our entire society as a whole."

"Tell me, has glasnost already won after 4 years of perestroyka?" asked Vladimir Antonovich and answered himself: It has not won. There are examples everywhere. Try, say, to get into the studios of the television program 'Vzglyad.' I do not remember whether they invited, say, V. Shcherbitskiy or the same Ivashko. Now, for instance, we in the Central Committee, myself included, already have interview invitations from the NOVOSTI Press Agency, from the newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES. But, as before, nothing from 'Vzglyad.' I take it that this program does not have full glasnost. Furthermore, the same situation prevails not only at central organizations of mass information, but here, in the capital of the Ukraine. That which the city paper PRAPOR KOMMUNIZMU will print, VECHERNIY KIEV may not take—here also, glasnost is not complete. We party workers take note of it.

Journalism must take definite positions of its own and not be appeased by those who act as a brake on perestroyka. This does not at all indicate a turning away from critical evaluations of events of the perestroyka period, but requires a heightened sense of responsibility of the party committees and press organs for the normal development of perestroyka, for the fate of the peoples of our entire country.

The meeting lasted more than 3 hours. In the course of the interview your correspondent handed V. Ivashko a note requesting an interview for SOVETSKAYA KULTURA at a time convenient to him. Vladimir Antonovich read it and said that he must think about the time and place for meeting a representative of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA. Later it turned out that the first secretary had an interview an hour later with a correspondent of an American paper.... And I thought: Why was priority given not to Soviet interviewers, but to their overseas colleagues? Maybe I think in old stereotypes?

Soviet Deputy Discusses Polish-Ukrainian Relations

AU2909133589 Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA in Polish 27 Sep 89 p 6

[Interview with Yuriy Shcherbak, secretary of the Writers Association of the Ukraine, deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet, and chairman of the commission for nuclear energy in the Supreme Soviet Committee for Ecology, by Jerzy Jachowicz: "The Ukraine—The Barriers of Fear Have Collapsed"—date and place not given]

[Text] [Jachowicz] What are the reasons for the revival in the Ukraine?

[Shcherbak] The turning point was Chernobyl. The blocking and falsifying of information as to what really happened there proved to be beyond people's endurance. This great tragedy united everybody. Everybody realized that only by organizing themselves, they could effectively defend their rights and protest against the evil. The barriers of fear, suspicion, and isolation suddenly collapsed. This is a new phenomenon in the history of postwar Ukraine.

[Jachowicz] Did the existence of "Solidarity" have any effect on this process?

[Shcherbak] During the years 1980 and 1981, we were completely cut off from any news of what was actually happening in Poland. Polish newspapers were withdrawn and ceased to be available. Our propaganda began to intensify its attacks on "Solidarity." They tried to discredit it. Possession of "Solidarity" press or publications carried heavy penalties.

Today it would seem that those days could not possibly come back. The era of Shcherbitskiy has come to an end. A few days ago he was expelled from the party central authorities, but his name will forever remain a synonym for the nightmarish policy against the Ukrainian nation and the systematic repression of the Ukrainian language and literature.

[Jachowicz] In your speech at the Congress of the National Movement of the Ukraine [as published], you stated that the national formula would be insufficient. Why?

[Shcherbak] The concept of a single nation, such as the one that you have in Poland, does not exist in the Ukraine. The Ukraine is a large country, and its regions differ in mentality. The level of national consciousness varies throughout the country. In Western Ukraine there exists a radical national movement with a very strong tradition and its own intelligentsia. If you look at the great industrial regions, such as the Donbas, Dnepropetrovsk, or Kharkov, these areas are very Russianized. You will find people in many regions who are ready to take up the struggle for greater liberalization and democratization of political life, but when it comes to the national question, they are much more cautious.

[Jachowicz] In your opinion, how do you see Polish-Ukrainian relations?

[Shcherbak] My private life is strongly linked to Poland. My wife is Polish, and my daughter is presently studying in Poland. Poland is a country that is very near to me. I have always envied the Poles for their love of their own history and the Polish spirit of freedom. I am in favor of friendship between our two nations—not for propaganda or official purposes—but a true friendship between peoples.

[Jachowicz] Could the reservations that there are on both sides get in the way of this?

[Shcherbak] Have you forgotten how warmly Adam Michnik was received at the Congress of the National Movement of the Ukraine? This warmth emphasizes the respect that exists in our society for Poland and the Poles. Of course there are deep reservations here, just as there are reservations in Poland. The social elites can easily understand each other without barriers or reservations, but it is more difficult to break down stereotypes that exist in the minds of simple people. The most important step leading to the dissipation of mutual reservations will be jointly published books that will present the most sensitive issues, events, and problems between the two peoples, however painful these issues and problems may be. Such a joint undertaking must flow from the basis of friendship. I will never forget the words of Iwaszkiewicz—who came from Kiev himself—when somebody wrote him a letter that went along the following lines: "You old scoundrel, have you forgotten what the Ukrainians did to us?" He replied: "I know everything, and I have not forgotten anything, but if we are to live together, we cannot cast stones at each other until the end of time."

[Jachowicz] Do you believe that changes along the lines of Ukrainian aspirations can be brought about by an alliance with the Communist Party?

[Shcherbak] If we are to speak seriously about the existence of the Soviet Union then, although the present party is undoubtedly bad and divided, we must recognize that it still represents the only integrating force we have. At the present time it is far too early to contemplate discarding this mechanism. This could have dire consequences. This vast country must undoubtedly be reformed and democratized, but any rupture with the present order could have incalculable consequences and would be politically nonsensical. If we are to push on with real politics, as opposed to political romantism, we cannot permit power to be seized by a particular group of people who feel themselves more secure when the tank engines are revving.

If the Ukraine wants to avoid such a solution, it must continue the partner-like dialogue with the reforming wing of the party in Moscow. This means that the only effective path toward economic, civic, and national freedoms is the road of parliamentary democracy. Poland is an example from which we can learn.

Belorussian Official on Public's Letters

LD1310083389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1257 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Minsk, 12 Oct (TASS)—Correspondent Tatyana Khryapina reports: Never before has the post office brought such a flood of letters and telegrams to the Belorussian Supreme Soviet Presidium as it has these days. People are discussing the pre-election draft laws of the republic, expressing their disagreement, and makeing suggestions and corrections.

"We have received 120,000 letters already, Lyudmila Syroyegina, secretary of the republic's Presidium, told us, "and although the time for the discussion has not run out yet, it is already clear today that the laws on election of people's deputies of the Belorussian SSR and the people's deputies of the local soviets should be somewhat different from the published draft laws."

A total of 48.8 percent of the writers call for abolishing the constituency [okruzhnoy] meetings that decided how many candidates and who exactly will stand in the elections. A total of 87.3 percent have spoken in favor of representatives of public organizations standing for election by direct balloting like all the rest of the candidates. At the latest elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet, this part of the deputies' corps was formed, in their opinion, by the ruling bodies of the public organizations.

The authors of the letters express practically unanimously (94.2 percent) their opinion about including not less than two candidates on the ballot. An absolute majority thinks that the chairmen of the supreme and local soviets of Belorussia should be elected by universal direct balloting.

"The work with the letters of the people living in the republic, Lyudmila Syroyegina stressed, "persuades one of their great interest in the adoption of democratic laws. That's why a direct transmission of the republic's Supreme Soviet session will be carried when they are being adopted. We continue to study public opinion on the procedcure for electing people's deputies and for designating their powers."

MVD Troop Commander Shatalin Profiled

PM0410145889 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 40, 1 Oct 89 p 5

[Leonid Miloslavskiy report: "The General's Line"]

[Text] In the spring of 1964 Senior Lieutenant Yuriy Shatalin got a bad mark on an exam at the Frunze Military Academy. He tried to prove to the teacher that there was a Khrushcev personality cult in the country, that there must be laws putting a limit on the abuse of power. Twentytwo years later Colonel-General Shatalin took over command of the interior troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs whose activities have not yet been regulated by the constitution and the law. The scope of the conflicts in Nagorno-Karabakh, Ferghana, Novyy Uzen, and Sukhumi depended solely on his personal qualities.

The photograph shows a rather rare venue: The chief of the interior troops is in his study in Krasnokazarmennaya Street (Shatalin has been in Moscow a total of three weeks since early May). There is nothing superfluous in the room and nothing particularly outstanding: bookshelves, official portraits (Lenin, Gorbachev, Ryzhkov) and maps. A nearly empty working desk; a notebook for entries, a pen for resolutions and signatures, and a pencil for remarks. And a large telephone table. Today is a "telephone" day - from 8 a.m. Shatalin receives reports from commanders of army formations.

Telephone: "Baku! Everything must be done to end the rail strike. I guarantee fulfilment of all reasonable demands of the strikers. Persuade people to send at least the trains with food for Armenia, today this is most important."

Shatalin was born in 1934 in Dmitrov near Moscow, graduated from a miltary school in Baku, and served for 15 years in Central Asia and four years in Trans-Caucasia. His son is a military translator and his daughter is married to a serviceman. Like the previous commander-in-chief, Yakovlev, he went over to the interior troops from the post of Chief of Staff of the Moscow Miltary District. His career can be considerd successful, although somewhat complicated by conflicts with superiors. At that time, in the Academy, his love of justice looked very much like dissidence. And if Khrushchev had not been removed half a year later, today someone else would be in command of the interior troops. Shatalin got off cheap - he served as a lieutenant for an extra two years. Later, in 1980, the commander of a division which was one of the first to enter Afghanistan was branded a pacifist. He persuaded the higher-ups that there was a need to respect the Afghans' hospitality and friendliness and we should not interfere in their internal affairs. But an order is an order, and he had to obey: the Qandahar bazaar was wiped out by tanks. Shatalin was declared an enemy of Islam. By 1981, he was already serving in Armenia.

Telephone: "Sukhumi! What's cooking over there? Twenty people... What's the reason for the strike? A way out has to be found. Maybe you should release those on whose behalf they are fasting. Let them go on the strikers' behalf - they can be put on trial six months later. The most important thing now is to diffuse the situation...."

In Sukhumi I saw Shatalin for the first time: the unofficial groups addressed him as "Comrade General" and promised him support. After the meeting one of them told me: "This man stopped a civil war in Abkhazia."

The war almost broke out on a bridge over the River Galidzga - several thousand Abkhazians and Georgians with rifles, submachine guns and machine guns were ready to open fire. It was possible to commit a division there and win by fighting - a logical order in an extreme situation. However, Shatalin arrived at the scene with 60 men: "I've come to defend you. Leave this to me and disperse." They trusted him.

Shatalin finds it more difficult to persuade people in office rooms. The general, who stopped a massacre with his words, can't change what he considers absurd: why should alcoholics at LTPCs (medical-labour prevention centres) be guarded by soldiers with submachine guns?

"Of course, we badly need a law - a detailed and unambiguous one. Especially now that a decision has been taken on increasing the numerical strength of the troops. (Telephone communications broke down and the Commander-in-Chief is free for a few minutes.) Eighteen months ago we prepared a draft Regulation, but it has still not been approved. The only Decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet 'On the Rights and Duties of the Interior Troops in the Protection of Public Order' was passed last year without taking into account our opinion."

From the summary on the location of the interior troops: there are about 21,000 servicemen on special assignments. Of them 11,000 are in Azerbaijan; 5,000 in Georgia, and 4,000 in Uzbekistan.

The right given by the Decree to the Minister of Internal Affairs to order troops to different regions of the country has never yet been used. All the additional forces of the interior troops were introduced at the request of the local authorities. And, as Shatalin says, solely to put an end to armed clashes.

"Our troops took no part in the Minsk events of last October, when force was used against a peaceful demonstration. I didn't order protesters to be dispersed in Tbilisi," he emphasizes. "That wasn't our mission. And strikes aren't our mission either. And troops mustn't be used to combat crime."

Mail is brought to the general: as usual, the thick file contains several letters with requests to bring in troops. The Chairman of the Alma-Ata City Executive Committee considers it necessary to have 200 soldiers, and by 1991—500, in connection with an increase in crime. The Chairman of the Chuvash ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers asks for 200 men in connection with alarming forecasts. If, God forbid, the worst comes to the worst, it is, of course, better to have soldiers at hand. But there aren't enough troops for the whole country—there is a need to look for other means of stabilization.

Telephone: "What's happening in Fergana and Namangan? Why is the Russian-speaking population leaving Dushanbe? This process has to be studied in detail, take statistics and analyze: how many people have left in comparison with last year, which social categories, what's the reason? Report the findings immediately."

The trouble is Shatalin is reluctant to deal with things which aren't "his business," yet he has to tackle them all the time. If only similar results could be achieved by those who have only "their own business" to deal with. In Baku the colonel-general met with the leaders of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan—virtually the first official to contact such an unrecognized organization. "How is it possible not to recognize them? No matter what you think, they are a real political force capable of making the whole Republic go on strike. There is a need for dialogue." On the following day tens of thousands were to attend an unsanctioned rally. The informals guaranteed order and requested that troops should not be sent in, so that people wouldn't be nervous. Shatalin agreed and himself came to the meeting, wearing not a general's uniform but civilian dress.

Nearly always the informals trust Shatalin in the same way. At any rate, his negotiations in difficult situations are, for the most part, more effective than attempts at persuasion by local leaders, although it isn't always possible to maintain civil relations. During the latest trip to Shusha (the Azerbaijanian town in Nagorno-Karabakh) Shatalin found himself taken hostage.

"Taken hostage? I wouldn't put it that way. I became one of my own free will. We came to Shusha with Generals Nechayev and Safonov, dropped in on the District Party Committee and inquired about the situation. They said that the people were restless: The day before two Azerbaijanis had been arrested for shooting in the street and taken to Stepanakert. People demanded their return. But that was a normal demand, not at variance with the law—a person must be tried where he committed his crime. I phoned Stepanakert and told them to send the men back. I was told to go out into the square and explain everything to the people. I went out—several thousand had already gathered there. Someone in the crowd shouted: 'not everyone can hear you, let's go to the club!' We went to the club. On our way they encircled us, and removed the magazine from a soldiers submachine gun. We were taken to a room and told: you won't leave until our men have been brought back. And they left women and children with us in the building. I told them: I've come here to solve your problems and I won't go anywhere before the arrested arrive. So we stayed there for five hours. A special purpose company CO phoned me and asked for an order to recapture us. But this couldn't be done by force of arms—there were people all around. Then the two men under arrest were brought back, and everything returned to normal."

A deputy entered the room and reported about the strike committee's terms for ending the railroad blockade of Armenia. Shatalin listened, interrupting:

"Open the road to Kirki? This can be done, I'll come to terms with the Armenians. Return the stolen cattle to Armenia? We can also persuade them to do this."

The last demand: the Armenians must apologize to the Azerbaijanians. Shatalin spread his hands.

"They know that this is impossible. It means that they don't want peace..."

The 12th day of the blockade was drawing to a close. During this time the Council of Ministers was drawing up a plan for solving the problem: to bring in railroad troops to work, and the interior troops—for their protection. Shatalin refused. He maintained that the negative consequences might outweigh all the benefits. He was convinced: there was a need to look for a political solution of the problems.

Vilnius Militia Refuses To Aid Army Officer

PM1710154989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Report by Senior Ensign V. Grinkevich: "Deal With It Yourself"]

[Text] Vilnius—On three occasions of late I, a serviceman, have had to endure nasty behavior in Vilnius. Here is the latest incident. I was returning home one evening after work. At a streetcar stop two middle-aged men called me an "occupier" and said that I had no business being in Lithuania.

I answered in Lithuanian. I warned them against attacking people like that. I told them that I was born here and that I can speak Lithuanian like a native, although my nationality is Polish. The reply was: "So you are an occupier three times over! First, you have betrayed Lithuanians. Second, you are a Pole. Third, you serve in the Red Army...." There is logic for you....

To avoid a showdown and to escape from some thugs who were beginning to breathe down my neck, I calmly walked over to a telephone. I dialed "02." In their presence I described the situation to the militia. And what was their response? "We do not come out in cases like this. Deal with it yourself. You are a soldier, so defend yourself...."

You can imagine my feelings, obviously. It is a good thing only I heard that. In fact, the conversation on "02" did the trick and made my "political accusers" back off. A happy ending, as they say. Has the protection of citizens' honor and dignity actually been, for some time now, in Lithuania, a matter for the citizens' themselves? We are talking about a law-based state, about the rights of the individual, and the primacy of the law, while, in fact, the legal organs, or, rather, the law-enforcement organs, are recommending: "Deal with it yourself...."

Lithuanian Party's Brazauskas Interviewed

PM1810100189 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 14 Oct 89 p7

[Interview with Lithuanian Communist Party First Secretary Algirdas-Mikolas Brazauskas by Sami 'Amarah in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] ['Amarah] Many people in Lithuania and in Moscow are saying that your republic is leaning toward secession from the Soviet Union. What is the truth?

[Brazauskas] I do not think it is as simple as that. Realists, whether workers or people in leading positions, know very well in what society they live, who surrounds us, and under what geopolitical system we operate. Everyone understands the likely reaction of the states neighboring us. I frankly say that it would be unreasonable not to take our realities into consideration. We must think about life afterwards. How could there be secession from the Soviet Union when Lithuania's industry depends 100 percent on imports of Soviet raw materials such as oil, gas, minerals, and cotton?

['Amarah] Lithuania is at present full of popular movements and is witnessing the formation of organizations which, some claim, are similar to political parties. What is your view? Do you support a multiparty system?

[Brazauskas] First of all, it is not a question of being for or against. Second, what is now taking place in Lithuania must be viewed realistically. I believe that I view what is happening in our country realistically. True, our republic is teeming with movements and even undeclared parties which are putting forward various programs. So, it is only natural that the Lithuanian Communist Party should face what is going on by reactivating its cadres in all fields and by dealing with the realities of the situation. We have therefore put forward a new program which is at present under discussion and which, I believe, will restore the party's role and restore the confidence of others in it. We have begun work without waiting for instructions from above. We have begun to move ahead. Some people believe we are lagging behind and others believe we are ahead of perestroyka. I say it frankly, each republic has its own pace of perestroyka.

['Amarah] Some people claim that Sajudis (the People's Movement in Lithuania) is more popular than the official party even though it leans to the left. How true is that?

[Brazauskas] I would not use that kind of classification. Left, right, and center are concepts which vary from society to society. It is difficult to judge matters from that angle. As regards Sajudis, it is a strong popular movement supported by various sectors of the population. It includes many party members and some official leaders, and the vast majority of the republic's members in the Soviet parliament are members of that movement. That is why no politician can ignore that organization. Sajudis is ahead of the party. It raises issues of interest to society while we are afraid to make decisions.

['Amarah] How could you be afraid of making decisions? You have actually made a decison on economic independence of which Moscow has approved. How do you seek economic independence when Western Europe is moving toward economic unity? Is there any idea of unifying the economies of the Baltic republics?

[Brazauskas] I have already said that we have begun to address the realities. In the past we used to always wait for instructions. The situation now is different from what it was in the past. The Baltic republics know what they want. There can be no unity before there is secession. Economic secession gives us the chance to build a strong economy with its own special characteristics that would be in harmony with our region. It enables us to consolidate our economy in such a way as to be able to deal with our neighbors equally, whether in Western Europe or the Soviet Union. What we are after is not secession in the negative sense. What is happening is actually an effective step to improve the economy. We can see what is going on in the Soviet Union, where everyone is looking for approriate ways to introduce reform. We too are doing the same thing. So there can be no talk of unity or integration before that phase is completed.

['Amarah] What about the special status you are requesting for your party in Lithuania—what some simplistically try to call "the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party?"

[Brazauskas] Our party is not seeking separation and our party's program does not call for independence. Our program now states our special status and defines our relations with the Soviet Communist Party. Our program also explains the party's representation in the central party bodies. As you know the latest Soviet Communist Party program was approved in 1986. The situation is now different in many ways, and today's objectives are different from past objectives. Many issues of national relations are being addressed now. Time passes and things change and the masses are talking about things that were unthinkable in the past.

['Amarah] You have mentioned the party's representation in the central party bodies. What do you think of the calls for representation of the republics in the Politburo and the central government?

[Brazauskas] The republics are represented in the higher organs of authority. As for representation in the central government, I say that that is perhaps something to think about. Representation in the Politburo, the Central Committee, and all elected bodies in general, is something that is indeed being contemplated. Many voices are calling for representation of the republics at the highest level of power.

['Amarah] What does President Mikhail Gorbachev think of this?

[Brazauskas] It would be better to ask him personally, but I do believe that solutions will be found to all these matters. They are at present under extensive discussion at all levels and in all circles. The time is ripe for resolving many issues of life in the Soviet Union. The parties in the republics need to have a special status and characteristics in harmony with the realities in the republics. The position of the parties cannot possibly be the same as the party committees in the districts and provinces. Party and economic conditions give rise to many issues, not to mention political matters.

['Amarah] That being the case, what do you think of the balances of power in parliament? What is your attitude toward the opposition group called the "regional group"? How does Mikhail Gorbachev conduct sessions?

[Brazauskas] Mikhail Gorbachev conducts sessions with great efficiency. An observer of parliament's proceedings would see that the members are very active and full of vitality. In the current parliament the positions and views of representatives and groups are beginning to emerge, reflecting the extent of differences of opinion. As regards the regional group, I am not acquainted with all aspects of its program. The members of that group are mostly Russians, or, to put it more accurately, from the Russian Republic. If the Baltic representatives' views are sometimes in harmony with theirs, that does not necessarily mean that we are one group. Clearly, the regional group has its own objectives which I believe should be discussed so that one may take a position on them.

Procurator Warns Yedinstvo Movement Leader

LD1010024189 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 9 Oct 89

[Text] The leader of the Yedintsvo movement, Valeriy Ivanov, was summoned to the Vilnius City Procurator's Office and warned officially of having violated acting laws. On 5th September Valeriy Ivanov appeared uninvited at the Vilnius plant and started agitating the workers to go on strike immediately. Part (?of) the workers yielded and a partial strike did take place. The application to the Procurator's Office was signed by 78 workers of the plant, who demanded that the organizers be punished and that the Yedintsvo leader compensate the losses incurred.

Vilnius People's Court Workers Go on Strike

LD0710043389 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 6 Oct 89

[Text] The people's court in one of the administrative areas in Vilnius went on strike today because of poor working conditions. It is believed this is the first case both in Lithuania and the Soviet Union that an institution of this kind goes on strike. According to the court's chairman (Donastas Ransavicius) the working conditions, apart from being exceptionally bad, lead to blatant violation of the norms of judicial procedure. Unless the lawyers' demands are met the court intends to continue the strike for at least a week.

Lithuanian-Polish Relationship Viewed

LD1210131589 Vilnius LITERATURA IR MENAS in Lithuanian No 21, 20 May 89 p 7

[Article by Edita Degutiene, entitled "Can Lithuanians Trust Poles?"]

[Excerpts] Even after having lived in Poland for a number of years Lithuanians have difficulty in understanding the peculiarly great interest exhibited by Poles toward Lithuania... Vilnius—in particular. Various clubs and associations are sprouting up here like mushrooms following a rain, all expressing their sentiments toward Vilnius and the Vilnius area. [Passage omitted] Such exaggerated attention to the land of Lithuania and its traditions appears as a strangely unhealthy even peculiar cult to Lithuanians.

Decent Poles understand that this must amaze or even anger Lithuanians. On several occasions they have even appealed to us to be more indulgent toward this and not to be amazed. " That is where our grandparents', parents', and even our childhood and youth were spent. Thus everything related to that period is very dear to each one of us. That is why our eyes are drawn to that city and its surrounding areas."

After all, we all harbor nostalgia and love for our birthplaces. What is important is how this is expressed. Polish press also contains some thoughts at times of its "nostalgia" that can hurt every Lithuanian's heart;—it blows all out of proportion that which had been contributed to Vilnius or Lithuania by Poles, ignoring and even belittling Lithuanian accomplishments. It is no secret that the Poles have long been known for their inflated feeling of national pride. Perhaps they are all convinced that if anyone had invented anything worthwhile, he surely must have had some Polish blood or had some other sort of connections with Poland. When they talk about Vilnius, one gets the impression our old capital is beautiful and pleasant only because it had been ruled at one time by the Poles. Yet someone named S. Stoma dares even to repeat an FRG citizen's words, that contemporary Vilnius—is a dead, even terror-inspiring city since it no longer houses its old pre-war residents-.(many of whom were Poles).

All in all there exist only a few such declarations. Among the various clubs and associations in existence, there also exist those that express friendly sentiments toward Lithuanians. Possibly the friendliest of the lot is the Lithuanian Friends Club (Klub Miloshnikov Litvy), which has been established in Warsaw fairly recently. The club draws its membership from numerous members of the intelligentsia and youth. It's initiator and founder is Professor Leonas Brodovskis [name rendered in Lithuanian]. He has just been elected chairman. His wife Danuta, a most pleasant and cultured woman, assists him. According to its founders, the club's goal is to improve Lithuanian-Polish relations. P. Losovskis, the famous Polish historian and activist of this club stated: " We Poles still harbor a great sentiment toward Lithuania, but our lack of comprehension concerning it or our earlier negative disposition toward it are even greater." For this reason the "Friends of Lithuania" have decided not to accept for membership any Poles who might be even slightly chauvinistic. "We oppose both the

Polonization and union ideas. We are for friendly cooperation between Poles and Lithuanians based on the principle of—the free with the free, equals with equals."

Members of this club have resolved to propogate everything that is good in Lithuania. For example last March a lecture was given at one of the central Warsaw reading rooms entitled: "In Order That Lithuania May Be Lithuania," by Deputy Chairman of the Lithuanian Friends Club R. Zaluska. It was a pleasure to hear this educated Pole elder, who last year visited Lithuania for the first time, praise Lithuanians and welcome all the changes of the past year in Lithuania. He devoted a lot of attention to Lithuanian Language Law... "It is vital to understand Lithuanians—after all this is a nation whose language had been suppressed by Russian. Thus it is totally clear they are now yearning to revive it," he said.

He also added he does not like articles that appear in the Polish press sometimes that are tendentious toward Lithuania.

While living in Warsaw I had the occasion to either read or hear how the Poles praise the work of our post office, how they are taken by the cleanliness and order of our streets and how they praise our bread and dairy products. The above mentioned lecture included many nice words of praise for Lithuanian architects and urban experts whose achievements, which in the opinion of the speaker far surpass those of the Poles.

It was nice to listen to this lecture, but even more nice and more open were the comments of those Poles who were assembled in the hall. "Lithuanians do not have much reason to respect and love Poles. Let us be mindful of how we treat Lithuanian history. After all, it is being twisted and everything is being depicted in a chauvinistic light. Lithuania is especially sensitive to Polonization. That is totally understandable. Until the Lublin Union Lithuania was a very powerful nation. We are afraid to acknowledge the fact it was much more powerful than Poland. Following the union, the Poles began Polonization. How can Lithuanians respect us then?! We all know Vilnius was seized from Lithuania by force by Poland. Vilnius Cathedral—is a symbol of Lithuania. We must understand Lithuania's reluctance to hold Polish services there. After all, we would really be opposed to having other than Polish masses celebrated at the Warsaw Cathedral. The Poles are obligated to learn Lithuanian if they constitute a minority in Lithuania. Even the pope discussed the duties of national minorities. Why does ZYCIE WARSZAWY dare to state that Lithuania's Poles don't want to and should not support Lithuanianism? Why then do they wish to support and do support Russification? Many of the Poles in Lithuania are really of Lithuanian extraction. Let them call themselves either Poles or Lithuanians and choose for themselves. Let us not meddle in this. Let us show one another more understanding and sincerity."

At the conclusion of this lengthy, but unnoticeably fast evening, R. Zaluska announced: A series of lectures on the Lithuanian Republic has been planned for the coming academic year at Warsaw University. The lectures will be presented by both Polish and Lithuanian scientists and public activists. [passage omitted]

Reportage on Latvian People's Front Congress

PM1810080189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Oct 89 First Edition p 2

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel M. Ziyeminsh, own correspondent accredited to the second congress of the People's Front of Latvia: "In the Grip of 'Emergency Conditions'"]

[Text] Riga—For 2 days the square in front of the political education building in Riga resembled an oriental bazaar by the bustle and the throngs of people gathered there at times. Only the carpet, pomegranate, and melon stalls were missing. The main goods on offer were national symbols and printed material offered by numerous "parties" and other unofficial formations, not just from the Baltic republics. All tastes and political persuasions were catered for.

Inside the building itself where sessions of the second congress of the People's Front of Latvia [PFL], a political organization which numbers 207,000 registered members and largely determines the current political situation in the republic, passions were sometimes seething just as much.

The theme of one of the statements which rang out at the congress—it was delivered by Academician A. Kalnynsh, who is well known in the republic—was: "The functioning of Latvia's economy under emergency conditions."

Like other journalists accredited to the congress—and there were more than 330 of us, including around 80 representatives of foreign newspapers and journals—I wanted to know: What made it necessary to include so strangely formulated a question on the agenda and to put it so categorically and bluntly? After all, you will agree: An uninitiated person would associate this formulation with some kind of natural disaster, a devastating hurricane, an earthquake, a flood, or, God preserve us, a nuclear disaster. So far nothing of the kind has happened on Latvia's territory. Nor have I heard scientists warning about any upcoming natural cataclysms in the foreseeable future. Yet suddenly we are confronted with "emergency conditions."

All this could be turned into a more or less successful joke were it not done and said in such earnest.

An "emergency situation," the respected academician said, cannot be ruled out, it has to be taken into consideration, and he even specified the prospective length of such a situation—from 4 to 6 months. And it could arise, he said, virtually the day after "Latvia has acquired full independence." He went on to draw the following picture for the benefit of those assembled:

Supplies of electricity and fuel to Latvia will stop, rolling stock will come to a standstill, problems will arise with food supplies, and the result will be a sharp fall in the population's living standards.

In drawing this terrifying picture of a "hard winter" in store for little Latvia, A. Kalnynsh was by no means trying to turn his compatriots against the "idea of independence," claiming that these are the difficulties and tribulations which we will have face along our path. Would it not be better then to continue living as we have done, without thinking about "secession" or "withdrawal from the USSR?" No, the scientist's idea developed in the opposite direction and was very clear-cut: The "idea of Latvia's independence" has taken a pretty good hold of a substantial section of the republic's population. Now it is allegedly time to pass from words to actions, to translate this "idea" into reality. How? For instance, by "establishing equal legal, economic, and social conditions for state, collective, private, and mixed ownership and encouraging private economic activities in particular." And why not raise the demand that "the means of production and financial and other resources administered by the USSR be handed over to the Latvian state" since "the cost of many of them was recouped long ago, and the USSR has, so to speak, lost its right to them"? Naturally, the USSR will not agree to this willingly, it will impose some sort of sanctions. Most probably an economic boycott, whose symptoms can be felt right now during the republic's preparations for economic accountability and self-financing.

It is then, the speaker said (and, incidentally, he was not alone in claiming this) that the "emergency situation" may arise, and it is necessary to take this into consideration and be ready for it.

These considerations were not left hanging in the air, they were formulated to constitute the basis of the new statutes and program of the PFL which has now embarked on the road toward an "independent and democratic Latvian Republic." The resolutions, adopted by the congress "On the Elimination of the CPSU's Monopoly of Power," "On the Assessment of the Political Events of 1940," and a number of others are imbued with the same spirit.

As a military man, I was naturally interested in the "military aspects" of the current platform of the PFL. I have to note straight away that as distinct from the previous program, which I had the opportunity to analyze in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, the present congress goes much further in its intentions. The new program, for instance, includes a special section entitled "Demilitarization" which consists of eight important program objectives. A number of provisions set out in other parts of the program relate directly or indirectly to present and future servicemen. For instance, in the sphere of social policy the PFL urges "suspension servicemen's pensions priveleges," and one of the congress resolutions contained an appeal to CSCE participant countries "to open constructive talks on creating a demilitarized zone in the area of the Baltic Sea which would include the territories of the Baltic countries—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania."

Let's ponder the meaning of the following objective of the PFL: "As from the 1989 fall draft, to enable draftees from Latvia to do their military service on the territory of the Baltic republics; sending elsewhere only draftees who have expressed in writing their wish to do their military service outside the Baltic republics." On what legal basis are draftees from Latvia to be granted this "privilege?" There is only one law on universal military duty in the country which applies equally to everyone; it regulates the procedure for discharging your military service. Deviating from this law would mean going against it.

On the eve of the PFL congress I had a rather difficult conversation with pickets who were besieging the building of the republic Supreme Soviet where the latest session, discussing a number of new draft laws, was taking place. It was known in advance that, among other things, deputies would exchange opinions on topical questions connected with the draft into the army. On the eve, the Latvian Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] Central Committee Secretariat had expressed its concern in connection with this issue, noting in particular that certain circles in the republic are urging young people to refuse to discharge their constitutional duty and that all this "leads to serious conflicts with the law and has a pernicious effect on young people's lives." The request was expressed that the question of service in the Armed Forces be discussed competently, with the participation of representatives of the republic's public, and that the possibility of introducing an alternative service on a legal basis be considered. Furthermore, the Latvian Women's League which operates within the PFL submitted its own draft law on this question to the Supreme Soviet.

Naturally, there is nothing reprehensible in this. Legislative initiative must come from somewhere. Why not submit, for instance, the question of an alternative form of service for all-around discussion, after a preliminary in-depth analysis, of course, and with a view to subsequent submission for consideration by the Supreme Soviet. However, I did talk to one of the pickets, Bayba Petersone, a staffer of the republic Academy of Sciences, an educational philosopher. Just like many others who were mounting the picket at the Supreme Soviet building, she was demanding that the question of an alternative form of service be resolved forthwith. Who, in her opinion, should have the right to opt for an alternative form of service? People who, due to their religious, political, moral, and ethical persuasions, are unable to serve in the Army. No less!

Incidentally, I met Bayba Petersone again at the PFL congress. It emerged that she is an activist of the movement for national independence which, together with the Helsinki-86 group and a number of other organizations, forms the radical wing of the PFL. Here at the congress

Petersone attracted attention by creating a critical situation, so to speak, in the congress proceedings, which is now being subjected to different interpretations by commentators.

I have my own opinion on this account, but to substantiate it I need to digress slightly.

It has long been said that there are contradictions within the PFL which might lead to a split in this organization or even to its dissolution. These claims are not totally unfounded since the PFL, as distinct from similar movements in the Baltic republics, unites people with widely diverging political views from all parts of the spectrum—from very moderate to extremely radical people. Yet of late, the movement for Latvia's national independence has begun to play an increasingly prominent role in determining the political complexion, strategy, and tactics of the PFL. Judging by appearances, it is laying claim to the leading role within the PFL. In one of his precongress statements D. Ivans, the leader of the PFL, who is currently being described as a very moderate politician, leveled sharp criticism against the line expounded in ATMODA, the PFL bulletin.

"ATMODA," he said, "has practically become a publication of the independence movement..."

In my opinion all these and some other details must be viewed as evidence of a consolidation of the positions of the radical group within the PFL. This is borne out yet again by a whole series of decisions, statements, and views in the nature of ultimatums which rang out at the congress and on its fringes.

What course will the PFL steer in the future? No matter how strange this may seem, but I asked myself this question after the congress had ended, when, logically, it should not have arisen. After all, new statutes, a new program, and a whole series of resolutions had been adopted. Everything had been defined, specified, formulated, and approved—that is, passed for implementation. Yet it is precisely the fact that it has been passed for implementation which is evoking doubt, and, why not admit it, a certain amount of concern. Take, for instance, the aforementioned "military aspects" of the new PFL program. Not everything within them is in line with present-day realities, the current state of the Armed Forces, and the demands for combat readiness.

It was no accident that the repesentatives of the new Duma were asked at the final press conference: "Who were the military specialists took part in the elaboration of the PFL 'Demilitarization' program?" The reply was an evasive:

We have all served in the Army at one time and know its problems. Comment is superfluous.

And so, what course will the PFL steer in the future?

Latvian People's Front on Citizens' Committees

PM2009075789 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 24 Aug 89 p 3

[Speech by Latvian People's Front leader Daynis Ivans reprinted from 22 August 1989 SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH and carried under the rubric "Point of View": "Our Path Is Parliamentary Struggle"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Today stances on citizens' committees are no longer just topics for discussion or polemics. Today attitudes toward the committees determine to a great extent the place of politicians and people in the complex spectrum of political groupings and in the disposition of forces. In this connection, we considered it necessary to publish the speech delivered by People's Front leader Daynis Ivans at the last, extraordinary session of the Latvian People's Front [LPF] Duma.

First of all, in my opinion, the greatest mistake was the fact that we did not discuss the problem of citizens' committees and did not work out a solution earlier, when they were just being conceived. Today the registration process has already begun and the LPF is in a complex situation. I think that the current situation has arisen in many respects thanks to our people's naivete and gullibility. Given the general mood of the masses and the great enthusiasm for the ideas of independence, it is difficult to take a stand against these ideas or against methods of achieving them. To my mind, the project for registration of citizens that is being examined and the project for Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic citizenship proposed by Boyars essentially represent the same course, one that taking us backwards. Today we are talking about creating, I stress, creating a new state. A Latvian state. This is what we wrote in our appeal calling on all the inhabitants of Latvia to consolidate. We are not talking about restoring the former state. I also believe that since the Latvian National Independence Movement [LNIM] put forward the idea of citizens' committees without discussing it either with the Duma or the LPF leadership, it is the LNIM that ought to implement the idea. It is beside the point that they have realized that they could not implement it on their own. And that is why they turned to the LPF. I am very worried by the large numbers of people who have joined in the registration of citizens. I am alarmed by the situation in which they may find themselves in the future, when the registration reaches a deadlock. Has the LNIM thought about how the citizens' committees (when they are organized) will arrive at the congress? And what will the congress do after it is convened? So far I have not heard a single definite answer capable of convincing me that it is necessary to participate in the registration or in support for the committees in general.

The potential—both political and practical—of the LPF must also be considered. We have heard here that the LNIM and the provisional center are unable to provide logistical support for the registration. But does the LPF have the potential? We all clearly felt the superhuman strain under which our coordination center worked during the spring elections. Our forces are not so great and our technical potential is not limitless. If we get involved in the registration process, we will not be able to devote all our energies to the upcoming elections. That is the first point.

Second, we must talk about our political potential. We have already talked about this, and I uphold my opinion that participation in the registration of citizens will make the LPF unable to maneuver.

We have begun a parliamentary struggle. Our policy is a policy of "increasing demands." I believe that the republic's Supreme Soviet has adopted a number of recent decisions as a result of our policy. This is the real path of perestroyka. We cannot expect the political situation to change by itself one fine day, expect the gentlemen in Moscow to wait at the negotiating table for us as representatives of plenipotentiary citizens of the Latvian republic, and expect the gentlemen from the United Nations to wait for us in order to discuss giving Latvia independence with the Coalition Council or the government formed by the congress of citizens' committees. Our only route, our only possibility, is to rely on our own forces alone. And to use these forces for parliamentary struggle. To win the elections and ensure we have influence in the future Supreme Soviet. What is more, I am not convinced about the purely legal course adopted by the citizens' committees. I was born after the war, in 1955. And now I am a citizen of the USSR, or, as it is written in the Latvian Constitution, a citizen of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic. And I certainly do not like the idea of someone—Peteris or Mikelis—registering me, deciding whether I am a citizen or not, and checking whether my father had citizenship before 1940. Only a state organization has the power to grant citizenship. That is what happens in all civilized countries. And we are granting citizenship of a nonexistent state. I do not care whether this state existed a long time ago or quite recently, or whether maybe some people consider that it still exists. I do not see the citizens' committees as a real force. I see a real force only in our republic's parliament. Whatever the parliament is like, I still see it only in parliament and in the election struggle. Nor do I understand how the LPF can participate in just the first stage—the registration of citizens and so on. I am sorry, but this is all interconnected—the congress and the future formation of power. In this case, the LPF would be like a prostitute who says one thing and does another. In my opinion, it is not the business of the LPF to create citizens' associations. Parties can be formed independently of the LPF. If you want to create a Latvian citizens' association or party, please do so, but do not drag the LPF into it. I think that the attempt to impose on the LPF the organization of citizens' committees and registration is unlawful. I can say it straight—it is simply a dishonest ploy. We clearly need to think more about the Latvia we want to create, we need to consider all the people with completely different views who want to form this Latvia. And our parliamentary methods are by no means exhausted, as some people think. Even if we have a minority in parliament, we can still fight as a faction. The right of nations to self-determination continues to exist and can be implemented in any circumstances.

I call for some very serious thought before we make a decision. We must be aware of all the consequences that a decision by the LPF to support the formation of citizens' committees would cause. The people will have faith in us, as today we have great prestige. But is there a basis for such faith and will we not find ourselves right back where we started in a couple of months' time? In that case, will we not have lost everything... including the parliamentary struggle? It is impossible to combine the paths. We must understand that as soon as we embark on the road that is being presented to us today (forced on us or proposed?), from that moment, we will lose the elections to the republic's Supreme Soviet....

Riga Conference Discusses Liberation of Baltic

PM1710105989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "The Memory of the Heroes Is Still Alive"]

[Text] Riga, 11 Oct—The memory of the unforgettable events of fall 1944, when Soviet troops passed through the liberated capital of the republic, has once again come to life for veterans of the Great Patriotic War. A scientific-theoretical conference is being held here today entitled "The 45th Anniversary of the Liberation of the Soviet Baltic from the German Fascist Invaders: Past and Present." Historians and social scientists from Moscow and Riga, prominent military chiefs, frontline veterans, participants in the partisan movement, emissaries from veteran organizations in other republics, party and soviet workers, and representatives of the USSR Armed Forces are taking part in it.

Latvia's Gorbunov Analyzes Range of Issues

18001651 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 12 Sep 89 pp 2, 3

[Latinform report: "We Do Not Need Any Political Impasses"]

[Text] **A.V. Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, participated in the regular 7 September broadcast of the television series "Opinion of the Leadership." In a conversation with television journalist Aldis Neymanis and in responses to questions of television viewers, he analyzed the sociopolitical situation in the republic. Special attention was devoted to preparations for the regular session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet which will be held on 6 October in Riga to consider the draft law "On Elections of Latvian SSR People's Deputies." Below we publish a transcript of this conversation, during which many questions that interest the republic's residents were raised.**

Neymanis: At the end of last year and the beginning of this year you were actually under crossfire. You were both reprimanded and praised. Now Ivar Kezbers has come under fire. He too is being criticized and praised from various sides. Has seeing these various processes from your position changed your forced, as it were, inactive participation in political life? Or are you prepared to join Ivar Kezbers and come under fire again?

Gorbunov: Ivan Kezbers inherited my previous job as secretary for ideology of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia. The range of his duties is very broad and the main thing is that many of these questions are becoming more crucial not only with each day, but with each hour. And each of them must be answered, for each of them he must express a position or organize concrete work. Today when the spectrum of various opinions in the republic's political life is so broad, this naturally evokes various attitudes toward Ivan Kezbers and his work.

Neymanis: But are you prepared to share his current fate with him?

Gorbunov: Share? At this point each of us has his own duties. But I am not only prepared to share his current concerns, but also to participate actively in this work, being a member of the bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia. Today, when in the republic's Supreme Soviet many problems have to be solved on a legal rather than a propagandistic level, naturally, one must have one's own position and act in accordance with one's principles, which I do.

Neymanis: Does this mean that this interval of time has not changed your position or are there certain observations that make you take a different view of what is going on?

Gorbunov: No, my observations have perhaps even strengthened my conviction that the path upon which we have entered is the correct one. Although, of course, the political situation is changing and realities must be taken into account.

Neymanis: Before we move on to questions that pertain directly to the forthcoming session of the republic Supreme Soviet, many viewers are asking: How do you evaluate the results of the last plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia?

Gorbunov: I have heard critical remarks regarding this and they are appropriate. But I should still like to emphasize the positive aspects. I shall not enumerate all of them but I should like to emphasize one aspect that is very important in my view. I recall the plenum of July of last year when, it seems to me, for the first time in history members of the Central Committee differed strongly in the opinions they expressed at the plenum. Varying opinions are in general a part of the normal process in a collegial organ. But still, what nervousness! Even antagonism to a certain degree. And today the spectrum of these opinions is even broader and they are sometimes quite different. But the plenum itself, in my opinion, proceeded in a businesslike way. In spite of various opinions. There was a dialogue, and a unified program of actions was adopted for all of the Latvian Communist Party. Of course I do not want to say that such an atmosphere of openness and conflicting opinions is an immense achievement, but it is the first step toward democratization of the activity of the collegial organ. And under the conditions of a difference of opinions, it turns out, it is possible to adopt a common program. Today the activity of many new social organizations is proceeding in this kind of lively atmosphere, and the party has ceased to be an exception in this respect.

Neymanis: Let us now move on to the session of the republic Supreme Soviet that is coming up on 6 October. First, there is the draft law on the elections of people's deputies and, second, the responses to the deputies' demands. Obviously the first point will be the most debatable and complicated. So, about the election law. What bothers you most in this process, what will have to be resolved, and where can various viewpoints be manifested?

Gorbunov: We have had enough time for a comprehensive assessment of this draft law. The major issues here are whether there should be just the Supreme Soviet or the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of People's Deputies. Whether there should be deputies from social organizations, and so forth. Even the opinions of the legal experts themselves have sometimes changed and proposals from the presidium have been adopted. The question is very serious. We are speaking about the essence and the competence of the highest authority in the republic. I have already expressed my opinion in the newspaper TSINYA: I am in favor of elections to the Supreme Soviet without a congress. I think that at the session one can hear various arguments in favor of one or the other variant, although one has the feeling that the majority are still inclined to have elections to the Supreme Soviet without a congress.

I should like to emphasize another thought. The more we deal with election issues and analyze this path of democratic parliamentarianism, the alternatives to which are clear today, the more frequently we arrive at a principle that has been achieved in world practice whereby universal, direct, and equal elections are held. The minute we fail to take one of these conditions into account, there are complications and discussions in which it is very difficult to prove anything, and then emotions come into play. I am speaking out in favor of this principle since it is the basis of elections according to the principles of democratic parliamentarianism. But we cannot simply bypass the situation in which the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet considered questions related to draft laws developed in Estonia and discussed at the session of that republic's Supreme Soviet. There are differences between them and us but the principle is the same: to elect to the supreme or local soviets people who have lived in the area for a certain amount of time.

The second important issue is the participation of the army in the elections. World practice varies here. Let us recall the recent elections of USSR people's deputies. Did the presence of the army really impede or influence these elections, even to a small degree? In any case the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet has no data to indicate that. And we ourselves had a practical interest in having the commander of the Baltic Military District be a USSR people's deputy.

Neymanis: In my opinion the tensest situation was observed in your electoral okrug where your competitor was a representative of the army. There were unjustified fears associated with this.

Gorbunov: Yes, they were unjustified. And I wish to emphasize once again that my opponent conducted himself quite respectably and no misunderstandings arose. And today too we are actually interested in having the army participate in the elections and nominate its candidates to be deputies. For they must be aware of the concerns and problems of the village, the city, or the republic as a whole where they are stationed. And we must know them. Of course the proposed system evokes various judgments. You will recall that Yanis Peters criticized it at the last session of the republic Supreme Soviet, and his arguments are difficult to refute. Now the army has been assigned a special place.

Neymanis: Guaranteed places.

Gorbunov: Guaranteed mandates. And I can find no arguments against the assertion that this is a privilege. But on the other hand I cannot agree with the published statements of USSR people's deputy Colonel V. Alksnis in which he asserts that this is the way the army is discredited. Nonetheless both of these arguments deserve to be analyzed once again and discussed in the Supreme Soviet.

Neymanis: Many television viewers are asking why the question of citizenship is not on the agenda.

Gorbunov: Yes, the question of citizenship is a very complex one. Because it is one of the constituent elements of the law-governed state. Last year when we were laying the foundation for this law-governed state we said that we would necessarily have to develop and adopt a law on citizenship. Very many people hoped that this law would help solve such problems as curtailment of unjustified migration and organization and adjustment of a political system for elections. Therefore the presidium of the Supreme Soviet also worked on this problem and, on assignment from the presidium, Professor Yu. Boyars developed a draft law which was discussed and published. But the discussion of this draft law and the situation surrounding the question of citizenship force us to study this question even more seriously. But not enough time has been set aside for this discussion. Of course I cannot say for sure, since this will be decided by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, but obviously we shall extend the time allotted for the discussion of this draft law. Moreover, I will not rule out the possibility that now that the elections are drawing near, the issue of citizenship will be finally decided by the new Supreme Soviet or Congress of People's Deputies. And here none of us should experience any kind of alarm because the law on citizenship cannot influence the elections. Ideas that have been expressed to the effect that the law would go into effect after the fact since we are now adhering unwaveringly to the principles of democracy does not hold up under criticism. And the second thing. In a purely practical sense it is impossible to adopt a law and then manage to do this immense amount of work in a couple of months.

Neymanis: You mean it is impossible in a purely physical sense?

Gorbunov: Yes, of course.

Neymanis: Here Comrade Shkutans asks: What is your attitude toward the citizens' committees and their activity at this moment?

Gorbunov: When I was forced to leave my job for a time I read in the newspapers about everything related to the problem. On the pages of the newspapers and especially in radio broadcasts various opinions are expressed regarding the citizens' committees. I shall answer briefly. First about the very term "citizens' committees." If we look at them from a legal standpoint, they must be chosen somehow. But who chose them and by what means? The next thing. About the registration of citizens. Registration is a legal act. How is the registration of citizens conducted? According to the principle of volunteering or in some other way? This might be the purely technical aspect of the matter but we understand that this action for the registration of citizens is not carried out for the sake of creating citizens' committees. If one were to judge from the statements of the, so to speak, radical wing of the Latvian People's Front in the press, we would all elect the Supreme Soviet together and it would develop democratic laws, we would be entering on the path of democratic parliamentarianism without violence, and so forth. The Supreme Soviet would be elected by all residents of the republic, all the people of Latvia. But in parallel we would be organizing citizens' committees which would subsequently determine the political status of the republic and would renew the citizenship and independence of Latvia. In my view, even this fact alone shows that we are at an impasse. But I think that the statements of the leaders and members of the Duma of the People's Front also contain other arguments which assert that we now need political stability in order for all the people to be able for the first time to participate in free elections. We need this political stability very much and we do not need political impasses for they impede this process. And if this process does not develop, what kind of sovereignty can there be?

Neymanis: Does this mean that the registration of citizens cannot be linked to the adoption of the law on citizenship?

Gorbunov: What is happening now cannot be considered registration. In principle this is simply a counting of the citizens. Moreover, yesterday I became familiar with the printed publication of the Saldus People's Front. Unfortunately I do not recall the name of the author who suggests registering and keeping track of everyone who speaks out in favor of Latvian independence. The task is changing even now. After all, these are serious things which should be considered in their totality, in all of their aspects.

Neymanis: Comrade Shkutans also asks: What is your attitude toward a multiparty system?

Gorbunov: You know, I organically reject demagoguery and dogmatism. On the other hand I cannot accept the kind of radicalism that sometimes verges on extremism. But I am profoundly convinced that much can be achieved by taking the path of democratic parliamentarianism. And if it is proclaimed that we are in favor of democracy then there is no way we can speak out against the possibility of the existence of a multiparty system. Otherwise we shall be completely inconsistent. And as concerns the present day, I as a party member, a member of the Communist Party of Latvia, wish for the Communist Party of Latvia to play a certain role in this process. For it can do a good deal in this process and will not have done everything if new political parties and schools appear in our country. But the path of democracy will still lead to this kind of pluralism.

Neymanis: I can foresee that this question will now come up: What is your attitude toward Article 6 of the Constitution?

Gorbunov: Actually, I already expressed my attitude when the People's Front program was created before its first congress. In my view it was stated very precisely there, and the leading role of the party was neither denied nor confirmed. At the same time other opinions appeared. The leading role of the party cannot be declared constitutionally; this leading role can be—this thought was expressed and I have nothing new to add—it can be confirmed only through its political activity and the concrete results of its work.

Neymanis: There are questions concerning passes for officers on leave in Riga. Is it intended to adopt a law on passes for officers? Comrades Ziyemelis, Liberta, Biyezays, Rozenshteyns, Liyekninsh, and a number of others are interested in this. A large number of questions have to do with the passes for officers since, as we know, in Moscow, Leningrad, and a number of other cities there are restrictions on these passes.

Gorbunov: Unfortunately, this question has not yet been sufficiently developed. We are in favor of having this process strictly limited and regulated. Up to this point it is practically uncontrolled. Of course every capital is interested in regulating the social composition of its population as it is done in Moscow and Leningrad. I think we could use the same arguments.

Neymanis: Again in this connection Comrade Savelev asks: In our republic in all probability there is a commission which deals with problems of the army so as to help our boys serving in it. What does this commission do? What are the results of its work? Or are there no results yet?

Gorbunov: Here, possibly, I shall return briefly to something I have already mentioned. You see, it is very important to us, taking into account the work experience of the USSR Supreme Soviet, for the army to participate in the work of the Supreme Soviet with its representative or representatives. And then it would be possible to create commissions which, in keeping with the official deputy status, could delve deeply into the problems that are associated with the army but at the same time fall under the competence of the republic and regulate them. But the question you asked just now is associated, of course, with the work of a specific commission which has already begun its activity. Unfortunately one must frankly admit that beginning perhaps in May and up until the last session in July, we created a very large number of commissions for solving crucial problems, but they have not actively taken up their work. And I am justifiably criticized for the fact that such an important commission of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet as the commission on language, which should be monitoring how the law on languages has begun to be enforced in the republic, unfortunately has not yet started its work. As you understand, the main reason for this is that people need to rest, and August is a time for vacations. Therefore the commissions have not yet begun their work wholeheartedly.

Neymanis: Comrade Klims is interested in knowing what is accomplished by the decree that was adopted concerning restriction of migration if today it is actually not being monitored or implemented. He speaks of Kraslavskiy and Daugavpilsskiy Rayons. Of course, we cannot verify these facts now.

Gorbunov: Perhaps we should not generalize this issue.

Neymanis: The aspect of nonfulfillment?

Gorbunov: Yes, since the figures and the analysis of the migration show the opposite. There is a Council of Ministers which adopted this decree in conjunction with the LRSPS [Latvian Republic Trade Union Council] and it should monitor its implementation.

Neymanis: So should specific cases be reported to the government?

Gorbunov: Quite right.

Neymanis: Comrade Rusetska asks: What is meant by sovereignty of the republic and the declaration that was adopted concerning it if only 20 percent of the enterprises belong to the republic?

Gorbunov: Of course there are many varying opinions and viewpoints regarding republic sovereignty and how it is to be realized. As concerns the declaration, it is the basis of the law-governed state. All the television viewers and radio listeners are well aware that we are the ones who made the declaration. Of course it is not simple to realize this sovereignty economically if one is speaking about enterprises, just as it is not simple to change over to economic accountability. The law on economic independence was adopted at the last session and now it must be realized in practice. Then this problem will be solved.

I should not like to be so naive as to assert that economic problems can be solved easily. If one is to speak about political and interethnic problems in the republic, which are actually not antagonistic by nature, they can and should be resolved in the spirit of agreement and dialogue—and there is a basis for this in the republic. As concerns direct economic problems, this question is much more complicated and difficult. Each of us must understand what economic independence means: If our incomes are greater than our expenditures then we are independent—this is elementary. It is here that independence starts.

Neymanis: A legal question and it is related to repressions. Have we solved at the level of the government the problem of returning the homes of people who were exiled from Riga—those who were deported in 1941 and have now been rehabilitated. As the legal experts explain, we must not offend the people who are living in these homes now. Comrade Gerke speaks of this.

Gorbunov: The question was asked in fairly general form and therefore the answer will not be very specific. The appropriate commission in the republic Council of Ministers is considering this question. If any disputes or misunderstandings arise they should appeal to the government. And if there they also think that the question cannot be fully resolved they should go to the Presidium of the republic Supreme Soviet and present the essence of the matter there as precisely as possible. This pertains especially to property cases. You know that this is one of the most complicated problems in jurisprudence and it requires precision in all of the details.

Neymanis: Shubin from Riga is interested: Can the republic Supreme Soviet not prohibit the activity of Interfront?

Gorbunov: As you probably know, the Presidium is also receiving questions about other social organizations whose activity they want to prohibit or somehow alter. I think that today when we are speaking about democratization, the social organizations which to a certain degree express the views of the residents of the republic and do not violate the Latvian SSR Constitution or its other laws have the right to exist regardless of the views they profess. This is my opinion. It is better for us to have these organizations with whom we can and should maintain a dialog. It is another thing—and this pertains not only to Interfront but to every social organization—that their activity must not break the law.

Neymanis: The television viewers are sending in questions which, in my opinion, do not pertain directly to Comrade Gorbunov. About the association of the newspapers TSINYA and SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA. About the fact that they cannot manage to get a taxi, that the roof is leaking, that there are no microbuses. Do we need a barber shop for dogs? Is it possible to get in to see a professional psychiatrist in Riga? Again about the repair of the roof. The question of a garden plot. I understand, esteemed television viewers, that the people who are asking these questions think they are very important, but the republic leaders can hardly be the kinds of tsars or superleaders who can solve each concrete problem. I appeal to you to send these requests to the appropriate ispolkoms [executive committees] and other institutions and have these problems solved by the people who are paid to solve them. Now let us return to the questions that pertain to the declarations of the CPSU Central Committee of 26 August. We have received many questions regarding this subject. For instance the television viewers want to know where we have fascist organizations in our republic.

Gorbunov: I know nothing about the existence of such organizations.

Neymanis: Will the session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet suggest holding the authors of the declaration responsible?

Gorbunov: Since we have touched on this declaration, which the official organs and individual citizens and party organizations have already discussed, I wish to express my opinion as well. I think the CPSU Central Committee has had reason for alarm regarding interethnic relations and the political situation in our republic and in all the Baltic republics as a whole. I think that the CPSU Central Committee is also alarmed about the situation in our republic's economy and other issues. And there is nothing wrong with having everybody aware of this alarm. But in my opinion it is important in which tone and in which form it is carried. I think the CPSU Central Committee should have delved more deeply into these issues and shown their concern in a tone and form and with arguments that would be comprehensible to the Baltic peoples. So that it would not be as it is today when on the pages of the newspaper one can see diametrically opposed opinions. For this shows that this declaration has not achieved its goal, and its authors should understand this.

Neymanis: Television viewer Ruska thinks that the consequences of the declaration can entail changes in the republic government. He asks: What would you do as president if Moscow tries to do this?

Gorbunov: The work of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which is distinguished by its democratism, shows that the government cannot be changed from above so simply. I think that the path of democratic parliamentarianism will be continued and changes in the government will be possible only by the will of the highest authorities in the republic.

Neymanis: Questions related to sovereignty. How do you assess the fact that the republic procurator is appointed in Moscow; that is, approved by Moscow?

Gorbunov: Yes, now he is appointed there. I support the changes envisioned in the Constitution which were considered at the last session in July. They determine that this is within the competence of the republic Supreme Soviet, and this is logical.

Neymanis: A question related to the previous one is asked by Comrade Petersons. Who is in charge of the troops of the Committee for State Security and Internal Forces in Latvia and how do they command them if these organizations are not under the jurisdiction of the republic Supreme Soviet or, at least, who is informed about what these forces are doing? Does the republic Supreme Soviet know about this?

Gorbunov: I would not like to agree with this conclusion which, in my opinion, is too common. In any case I cannot say that our Ministry of Internal Affairs or Committee for State Security is not under the jurisdiction of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet. I do not know of any cases in which the Supreme Soviet has made a decision that has not been implemented out of principle. Of course it might happen that some decree might not be fully implemented because of purely professional reasons. But that is another issue.

In practice both the Committee for State Security and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, if we are to speak of these two organs, taking into account the extremely critical situation with respect to crime, are very interested in cooperating with the republic Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers and all of our society. Therefore a council has been created under the Supreme Soviet which is now to coordinate and organize all of its work. Of course there are professional questions which are still being resolved at the union level, but I emphasize again that we have no disagreements with the leaders of these organizations which would be a basis for the conclusion that they are not subordinate to the Supreme Soviet and the republic government.

Neymanis: Another process is very crucial today. After the well-known declaration of the CPSU Central Committee these days reports from the Baltic republics are appearing in the central press and central television. One must say that very many television viewers consider this to be sabotage of our republics and are asking what we could do to make the central press and television, and specifically the information program "Vremya," reflect the situation in the republic objectively. Many suggestions are being made, say, to organize some kind of television press conference for all the leaders of the Baltic republics so that the impression that has been made about us throughout the country will at least be alleviated if not completely changed.

Gorbunov: Yes, the situation with respect to information in the unionwide press, radio, and television is a difficult one. We ourselves should also speak more frequently and more actively. So I think this suggestion is quite appropriate. I think that now we absolutely must present our opinions regarding the situation in the Baltic states both at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, during the course of the work of its commissions, and at the forthcoming plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

Now we sometimes say that workers of the central press, radio, and television are spreading misinformation about our republic and the Baltic states as a whole. I would not say that. In my opinion they are simply not delving into our problems and are approaching them very superficially. And in gathering information they take the simplest path. In the spring we played host to many foreign journalists, and there are many of them here now as well. I liked the fact that they were here to gain a clearer idea of the situation in our republic and gleaned information through all possible channels. Then, on the basis of this information, they tried to give their commentary and raise the level of objectivity. I think the correspondents of our central publications, radio, and television should also work this way. It is no longer sufficient simply to conduct an interview somewhere on the street and then simply show it without any comment.

Neymanis: Do you think it is possible for Latvia to develop outside the USSR?

Gorbunov: Thus we are returning again to the question of sovereignty. You know, this is both a practical and a philosophical question. Perhaps I shall begin with the latter. We have many ideals. One of our sacred ideals is a nation's right to self-determination. And the person who objects to this either does not understand the essence of the matter or is deliberately touching the sensitive spots in the national self-awareness. Therefore it is appropriate to raise the question of self-determination and of sovereignty outside the USSR, of course, and there is no need to answer "no" right away. But there is the major question: How is this ideal to be achieved? And here various paths and approaches appear. I shall say the following: The main thing is not to use, appropriately or inappropriately, the idea which is very close to the people and which it has always been possible to use highly effectively for propaganda purposes. In our history there have already been such ideals which have been proclaimed from every corner—the ideal of socialism, for example. And they really were close to the people, and why not—after all, they include fraternity, equality, and liberty, all for the good of the people, and so forth.

The ideals were simply declared and sometimes their practical realization was forgotten. As a result we have not approached these ideals of socialism as much as we have removed ourselves from them. There is no need to draw the parallels here. But anyway. Although in Sweden, Finland, and Austria they have not glorified the ideals of socialism, they have come much closer than we have to the principles of socialism; for example, improvement of the well-being of the people. And I would advise approaching the question of sovereignty from somewhat philosophical positions. As concerns practical approaches, we must be realists. Today in practice Latvia cannot exist outside the USSR. Today. And therefore before moving on to a debate of this subject we must first figure out its practical content. Otherwise we shall not approach this ideal but, on the contrary, move further away from it.

Neymanis: Does it follow from what you have said that we must find an objective path and not advance on just any paths in this matter, as has previously been the case?

Gorbunov: Quite right. That situation is inadmissible. For all the rest of the world has developed relying on a real situation. And it seems to me that we today must advance toward our ideal while relying on reality.

Neymanis: Television viewer Alkisne asks: Will the republic Supreme Soviet come to a decision about granting mothers leave for up to 3 years to care for children? Or will the parliament wait until this decision is made by the USSR Supreme Soviet? I think the answer has already been given today in the Panorama program where it was stated that beginning 1 January 1990 this leave would be granted to all mothers without exception. So far, true, the leave is unpaid. The leave will be paid for up to a year. This question will be decided in our republic as well. And this obviously falls within the competence of our government.

Gorbunov: Undoubtedly. I think that in the final year of the current 5-year plan we can essentially change the system for distributing funds for this. But the new composition of the republic Supreme Soviet will definitely begin its activity with social programs since this is being done in the USSR Supreme Soviet. We are also dealing actively with these issues.

Neymanis: A docent from Leningrad State University, Daugovish, and the dean of the Philology Department, Bertulis, ask what your attitude is toward the possible creation of a humanities institute in Riga with the classes held in Russian.

Gorbunov: This proposal was first heard at a forum of the peoples of Latvia. I supported it then and I support it now in spite of the fact that, of course, we have many problems in public education which are still waiting to be solved. People could present me with many cases such, for example, as the unsatisfactory condition of the dormitories of the creative VUZ's [higher educational institutions] or the schools for applied art. There are also many problems in the university itself. But it seems to me that if we wish to conduct a harmonious and constructive national policy then the republic has a need for such a VUZ. We have created a work group which is now studying this problem and opponents will also have the opportunity to express their views. A decree will be adopted taking into account the diversity of opinions and arguments.

Neymanis: About the law. Comrades Avotinsh from Kekava and Rudzitis from Riga, as well as many others, raise the fairly painful question of illegal assignment of apartments. We hear of many cases like this. People are asking what the punishment is for the guilty parties and when this practice will stop.

Gorbunov: It is difficult for me to say when violations of the law will stop since you can always find someone who will want to get around the law. But I think now that the public through various organizations is becoming involved in the distribution of housing, broader possibilities are being created for monitoring the legality of the distribution of apartments. Now, incidentally, this is proceeding openly.

Neymanis: This question: Is it possible to register a deputy candidate who does not recognize the legality of Soviet power in Latvia and whose program suggests eliminating this power?

Gorbunov: Any candidate can be registered, regardless of how he feels about the existing system and of whether he criticizes it or even calls for replacing it. It is another matter that it is quite unacceptable to call for doing this in an undemocratic, nonparliamentarian way, or through violence.

Neymanis: As is written in the Constitution, violence is prohibited by law.

Gorbunov: Yes.

Neymanis: Another question. What makes Comrade Gorbunov think the Communist Party of Latvia is the only party that can effectively solve economic and political problems if this has not happened during all of its preceding practice?

Gorbunov: This is a good question, of course. It is not easy for me to answer it. But I think that in the party itself there are certain progressive forces which began perestroyka and their first achievement has been democratization of political life. Therefore, when speaking about these forces, we cannot say that nothing real has happened regarding perestroyka. A good deal has already been done. And therefore I think that these forces could further advance the cause of economic restructuring by conducting a radical reform without putting off from year to year the solutions to those painful problems that face us today.

Neymanis: Overcoming inertia?

Gorbunov: Yes, absolutely.

Neymanis: A very large number of questions are related to the chairman of the Riga city executive committee, Comrade Rubiks. What is your reaction to the demand of the People's Front to fire him? A number of television viewers are interested in your attitude toward this.

Gorbunov: Esteemed television viewers, since once again I am before you and must answer any question you ask, it would be better to ask me how I feel about one or another of Comrade Rubiks' decisions or some idea he has expressed publicly. But as for him as an official, I think we all must be guided by the existing principles of democratic parliamentarianism. Comrade Rubiks was elected to this position and was not appointed by the presidium of the republic Supreme Soviet, and therefore it would be incorrect for me to answer this question in any more specific way.

Neymanis: In other words, as long as the voters support him he may retain his position. When the support disappears he will have to give up his elective position.

Gorbunov: Quite right.

Neymanis: Another such question. How can one get in to see you? Television viewers Naumov and Yakobsone ask about this.

Gorbunov: This is an important and difficult question. Already in the newspaper TSINYA, expressing my attitude toward my work in the USSR Supreme Soviet, I said that in March I found myself in a terrible position since I always had to be in Moscow in the USSR Supreme Soviet and I still had just as much work to do in the republic. Unfortunately, I am not at home very much. Therefore you have already warned the television viewers that I am leaving again for another session and will be participating in the work of the commissions. But still I shall try to see as many people as I can. You can call me at this number: 32-29-38. This is the telephone number of my secretary or assistant in the office. Perhaps I will not always be able to fulfill a request at a time that is convenient for the visitor, but I think in any case we will be able to agree on something.

Neymanis: How do you feel about the number 13? One television viewer also asks if you believe in God. Is this some kind of superstition?

Gorbunov: Today a good deal is being said and discussed and much more is being explained about faith and religion. I think this is very good for every person has his own faith. If a person has no faith it is very difficult to speak with him about human values or about how he understands them. My attitude toward faith and religion is related to this.

Neymanis: And the number 13?

Gorbunov: You know, there has simply never been an occasion when I have paid any attention to this number.

Neymanis: Winding up our conversation, I would like to voice a couple of wishes. That Comrade Gorbunov may never run out of benevolence, love, humanity, and courage, and that his son may have an equally strong character! A group of veterans of the Great Patriotic War from Limbazhskiy Rayon thanks you. And television viewer Lasmane says to you: Thank you very much, good luck and support in your position between a rock and a hard place! This pertains to the crossfire I mentioned earlier. And another question which, frankly, I put off until the end. It is asked by television viewers Liva and Leya from Valmiyery. Do you recall how you answered the question "are you happy?" at a press conference after the congress of the People's Front of Latvia last year? Do you feel the same way today?

Gorbunov: You see I am almost at the age when my views do not change so easily. What I said last year, although it was said somewhat humorously, was based on certain values toward which my attitude has not changed and which today constrain me to assert the same thing I said last year.

Neymanis: Thank you. Our main questions have actually been exhausted. I thank you for your participation in the discussion. We wish you success in your work in Moscow and at the session! Thank you viewers!

Gorbunov: Thank you.

Estonian People's Front Chairman Interviewed

LD1710124489 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 15 Oct 89

[Text] Another session of the Baltic Council, which joins democratic popular movements of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, came to an end today in Parnu. I asked Rein Veidemann, present chairman of the board of the Estonian People's Front, to speak of its results.

[Begin recording] [Veidemann] One can say that this session was again fairly constructive. We viewed the political situation of the present moment in the Baltic republics. As is known, this has become somewhat complicated after the recent Supreme Soviet sessions. A certain political vacuum is being felt; one could even say, a sense of being at a loss. The discussion included these matters.

This indeed is not only characteristic of the situation in Estonia, but it also repeats itself in its own fashion to some degree in Latvia and Lithuania. We obtained a fairly thorough survey of the latest congress of the Latvian People's Front. We also spent a lot of time on the relationship of the popular movement with the other political forces.

[Reporter] I believe that our radio listeners are interested in the state of affairs in the Communist Party of Lithuania. It is known that they held a plenum over there, but not much information has reached us. How did the plenum end [words indistinct]?

[Veidemann] One has to say that the representatives of the Sajudis movement there did not have full information at their disposal. However, one can still say that within the Communist Party of Lithuania—just as within the Communist Party of Estonia—a wing is becoming prominent, pressing fairly persistently for the Communist Party to become dependent int the way that this has now been repeated, developed, or evolved in the countries of people's democracy, for example. The possibility of such developments is not ruled out in the Baltic countries.

[Reporter] Is the Lithuanian Sajudis also convening its congress?

[Veidemann] Yes, the regular congress is coming next year for them, just as it is for the Estonian People's Front. It is planned to be convened next spring. This fall we will limit ourselves to a conference on elections.

[Reporter] The elections into local soviets are coming both for us and Latvia and Lithuania. Our People's Front has now more or less set out its electoral platform. How do the matters stand in other republics? Was there some talk of this at the Baltic Council?

[Veidemann] Yes. One of the points of the agenda was indeed devoted to listening to the electoral platform of the Estonian People's Front. This indeed is ready; and it also received an approval, in principle, at the latest session of the Council of the People's Front. And we provided indeed a fairly precise picture of our strategy and tactics for the elections. And one must say that in this area we are surprisingly in harmony with the other Baltic states. Their electoral platforms, too, have mostly centered upon the same points, the same emphasis as the Estonian People's Front's electoral platform. If one sums it up in a sentence then the deeper essence of the platform manifests itslef like this: the people's fronts are indeed meeting the elections as a compact political force, and the main ideology of this force is that the people's fronts are ready to have a share of power in the way of real political forces and to be held responsible for implementing this power. [end recording]

Balts Accused of Endangering Perestroyka

90UN0027A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 40, 4 Oct 89 p 12

[Letter by Naum Korzhavin: "To All Those Who Want To Listen to Me in the Baltic Area"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Early this year the poet Naum Korzhavin, who has lived in the United States since 1974, visited Moscow. He met with readers, spoke on TV, and talked to journalists, including a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent (see issue No 12, 22 March of this year). Hoping that this meeting on native soil was not the last, we invited Korzhavin to take part in our "roundtable" devoted to the poetry of Russian emigres (when he visits Moscow next time). We waited for an answer. However, we received a letter from Boston we did not expect.... This "detached view" may be useful in solving our complex interethnic problems.

I am writing to you although I am not at all convinced that this makes sense. First of all, I am far away in Boston whence this letter may not arrive in time. Besides, one is always tempted to think that it is easy to lecture from far away. Furthermore, I am still a Russian poet and, in general, a person who feels for Russia although I am of Jewish descent—therefore, in your scheme of things, I am defending the interests of the opposite side. The main point is: Who do I think I am for them to listen to me at all, especially at a moment like this?!

Let us strike the word "lecture" from our vocabulary altogether. I am stating my opinion caused by alarm, rather than lecturing. As far as the moral right to address you at a moment like this, I believe I have it.... I wrote about your tragedy as early as in the beginning of the 1960's in the poem "The Fraternal Cemetery in Riga" and in the "Poem of Sin...." It is not my fault that this was published only in the emigre press, and that only recently was the "Fraternal Cemetery in Riga" quoted almost in full in DAUGAVA. Therefore, I feel that I have the right to tell you what I think at this time as well. However, everyone has a right to voice his alarm and thoughts.

It is your business whether you agree to hear me out or not. I am writing this letter because I cannot but write it, because I treat what has been happening very seriously and fear its consequences for everyone, including you, and believe that it is my duty to do everything in order to prevent them.... As Tvardovskiy said: "Danila, complete your service honestly, and what comes next is not up to you."

Your pain is understandable, and I sympathize with it. Some nonsensical and alien force—that is, we under the power of Stalinism—came and profoundly disrupted your life. The fact that in the process the disrupted life of your average person was much easier than normal life in Russia cannot and should not give you solace. I do not have to look into the secret protocol to the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact, find its original, and compare it with the copy to acknowledge that you are right. The fact that I do not doubt the existence of this protocol is not the only reason, not at all. It is just that I think the protocol is merely an additional, impressive, and bitter detail of this time in our history, more so of our history than of yours.... I find it even somewhat strange that you attribute so much significance to it. Would it have been easier for you had the troops been deployed without any agreement with Hitler, but what indeed followed would have followed?

Incidentally, about the protocol. I believe that your very heightened interest in it is caused by the effort to influence the feelings of others rather than express your own or, more precisely, by the effort to influence the public opinion of the world so as to ensure its support for you.... I will not dwell on the issue of whether one can seriously count on this opinion, its sensibility, responsibility, and steadfastness. I will only ask this: What is the objective of the goal for which you would like to ensure support? I will answer this: in achieving or—more precisely—regaining complete independence.

There is nothing shameful or dishonorable about this objective. Striving for this is understandable and natural from the emotional standpoint, especially after all you have been through. Generally, it is not at all up to me to decide how reasonable your aspiration to complete political independence is. I know that in your community as well various opinions exist with regard to this. Some are convinced that it would be much more reasonable for your countries to participate in a general federation if the situation in the country is normalized, provided, of course, that autonomy is strictly complied with. I will not conceal that such a solution appears to me as well to be the most reasonable. However, it is my personal opinion, and I cannot impose it on you, nor do I feel that I have the right to do so. Under normal circumstances, you are the only ones who have the right to resolve this issue. However, to this end the situation has got to be normalized at least in some manner. If this does not succeed, then there will be nothing, neither autonomy nor independence. Instead, there will be a very mature socialism under the foodstuffs program (they will most likely come up with another name), which we still have not entirely overcome, and its inherent attribute—the complete "flourishing" of all peoples, including the peoples of the Baltic area, the "flourishing" in the course of which only lunatics, for whom special locations are assigned so they can be placed in a properly organized state, will be able to dream about autonomy, to say nothing of independence. Have you forgotten how this looks? You should not have. We have not left this "flourishing" that far behind us. Specialists in establishing it and complying with it (and, of course, in using it for personal gain) are still around waiting for the restoration of their rights which have been trampled. By holding each other's hands in a chain of 1 or 2 million people, you are rendering priceless assistance to these people. I am not an enemy of your independence. However, under our present conditions, demanding independence and the actions caused by aspiring to it look irresponsible and extremist no matter what one's attitude toward this demand is. They are advantageous not for those who understand and sympathize with you, but for those who are not inclined to sympathize with anybody due to their social nature and the complete lack of correspondence between the scope of their personality and the position and role attained (this is the heritage of Stalinism). Gorbachev has struck serious blows but, unfortunately, not fatal ones at this stratum. Now you are helping them to strike a blow at Gorbachev, at any rate at everything associated with his name that is the best.

How can they fail to start yelling under the circumstances! "They are getting out of hand!" Do you think they will not find a grateful (and, what is most important, still influential) audience? You hardly think so. Then what—are you hoping to bail yourselves out on the sly so that the fury of these hard-line zealots would come down on someone else? You feel no responsibility for us. Supposedly, why should the victim be responsible for the fate of the occupier? Of course, it is so if we think in general terms. If we think like people, then you have lived in the USSR long enough to understand that as people we were occupiers in 1940 no more than your children who have taken part in the Afghan war. Besides, many Balts played some, at times quite essential role in asserting in our country the force which later invaded your countries. Some steps by your governments, young at the time, also facilitated this. I am not at all saying this in order to shift onto you all the blame for your troubles, but in order to recall that we are bound by history after all, and that national egoism is not the supreme wisdom. To be sure, the last time you had to pay for the myopia caused by it as many as 20 years later. This time, it can "pay off" for you and all of us much faster. I do not mean all of your demands, but rather their continuous and irresponsible escalation in one direction, and then only because, in my view, it leads into an abyss.

Why is this necessary? After all, you may achieve and have already achieved a lot without aggravating the situation. For example, your autonomy has been expanded considerably. In general, over the time of perestroyka you have succeeded in securing more for yourselves than all other republics. You had every reason to do so, and this commands nothing but respect on my part. However, this is no rationale for undermining perestroyka!

However, you say that you do not want this. Nevertheless, the escalation of demands bespeaks the opposite. You hold the central government to its word, use its difficulties, and its fear of compromising itself and perestroyka so that things turn out your way as if on their own, as if you were playing chess. However, this is not chess. Those whom you can reinforce by this "game" are not afraid of being compromised in any way. It is impossible to beat them at any chess game because they are used to changing the rules of the game in progress, changing the position and number of pieces on the board, and subsequently explaining in a fatherly tone to those outraged that they are mistaken, almost with sincerity (there is a resolution to consider this expedient). After all, even the "public opinion of the world" (as it is, you count on it as well) was frequently mesmerized by that. Therefore, they are not the ones compromised but those who lend an ear to your demands. What do you need such chess for?

I understand that you are concerned about the demographic situation artificially created in your republics. This is why I do not object to measures restricting the influx of new population from other areas of the country. I am tolerant even with regard to your measures, which do not look too good, against the purchase and export of goods by temporary visitors. These measures looked particularly bad in the beginning when self- administered customs inspections on trains and buses were performed without authorization, spontaneously, and, one believes, with patriotic fervor. They took their own back from the occupiers, so to say. To be sure, the occupiers were residents of Pskov Oblast and other such oblasts who, according to Stalin's scheme of things, did not have at all to be clothed, fed, or get to live in general. However, I acknowledge your right to behave like that, but I do not sympathize. As they say, you have no control of your likes and dislikes....

This can at least be understood; this is about goods... foodstuffs... However, I cannot begin to fathom why those who have lived in the republic less than 2 years have to be deprived of the right to vote in Estonia, even if only elections to the local organs of power are at issue. This is not even chess, this is shooting yourself in the foot. Actually, it might effect a very small number of people (on the scale of a republic, a flash in the pan, with the political advantage being zero). However, even now it has insulted considerably more people.... because in this act the desire to discriminate was clearly shown. This is a concession to passions which evokes (and has evoked) illegal passions. And they have still turned some of your indisputable correctness to their advantage. [Footnote: They are not historically right. Still it should be taken into account that the people who have lived for a substantial part of their life or were altogether born in Riga, Tallinn, or Vilnius and whom some would now not mind expelling from there, even in the name of the triumph of historical justice, also experience the drama of their lives. They are people, after all, a majority of whom are PERSONALLY guilty of nothing.] However, they are not the issue. Even if they were not around at all no central government would be able to grant you independence at present even if it would very much want to, for the simple reason that in this event an immediate chain reaction and very rapid disintegration of the state would begin. To be sure, the opinion exists that it would be for the better. Supposedly this is the last colonial power, and to hell with it. However, these are merely words. The situation in the country is difficult, and the temptation to break away somehow is quite contagious for the activists (who under such circumstances appear in abundance, and not only in regions such as yours). However, far from in all regions would it be as easy to overcome internal difficulties as in your countries. It smacks of blood and chaos, of new Idi Amins who are, after all, also the product of the disintegration of some empires (could it be that this process is not that unambiguously positive?). The situation is exacerbated by the fact that at issue are not some overseas territories, that everything is next door, and the chaos would not be overseas either.... The population is mixed enough, and there are republics where both a Balt and who have you could suffer as a Russian. You have no reason to be certain that after you (your extremists) get their way and "everything collapses" this will not ultimately come down on you. This is to say nothing of the fact that those I have just mentioned will also try to take advantage of this chaos.

Try to be still more careful. When the situation gets back to normal, but you are still not satisfied with autonomy, you will be able to again raise the issue of your independence and secure it. However, trying to accomplish it at present while disregarding the things which are going to happen to all the rest of us is not only dishonorable, and I would say, ungodly, but also shortsighted. This means destroying both yourself and others.

What about if it were just the others, just us? You would escape, and we would be buried because of that? Or is it that you do not care? Just as long as we make it out, we could not care less. To hell with them, the occupiers—is that it? This however, is spiritual entropy—a philosophy anyone comprehends, a philosophy which is fraught with consequences for all of us.

Let us go back to our topic, to gaining independence immediately. There is one more aspect involved. If you indeed secured it now, your demographic problems would be insoluble. Then what many of you want to do would be called the oppression of national minorities (after all, then you would be the dominant nation), and some of it altogether a deportation. Small European countries simply cannot allow their reputation to be damaged that way, especially in the period of their emergence. After all, it is to small countries that world public opinion usually displays its nobility.

All of us are harnessed to the same chariot, and nobody can unhitch from this harness in motion without pain for himself and others. Everything will get entangled, and all will be crushed. We have to reckon with others. Your broadest political autonomy, including economic, is not only just, but it is also necessary for everyone. However, an attempt to take advantage of the situation in order to achieve independence (which was unjustly taken from you) as soon as possible is pernicious for all of us. It is only possible to solve this problem within the scope of a unified large state under the general normalization of life. This is what we should strive for. Solving all problems, including those of the world, depends on this.

Soviet Leaders Receive Orthodox Church Leaders

Shevardnadze

LD1710201789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A meeting took place in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs today between Comrade Shevardnadze and the members of the synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Metropolitans Filaret of Kiev and Galich, Filaret of Minsk and Gomel, Yuvenaliy of Kolomna and Krutitsky, and Vladimir of Rostov and Novocherkassk.

In the course of committed and active dialogue about cardinal problems of restructuring in the country and about USSR foreign policy, the relations of mutual respect between the Soviet state and the Russain Orthodox church have been reaffirmed. The members of the synod spoke about the efforts of the Orthodox Church aimed at the support of restructuring, consolidation of the Soviet society, and at solving urgent international problems.

Comrade Shevardnadze stressed that the Soviet Government highly values the contributioon of the Russian Orthodox Church, as well as of other religions, in asserting moral and ethical principles and values common to all mankind. Their peacemaking activity and their participation in the struggle for disarmament and for nuclear and violence-free world are now acquiring great importance.

Mutual intentions of deepening constructive cooperation in the cause of building a law-governed state in the Soviet Union and of humanizing international relations has been expressed. [video shows Shevardnadze flanked by two unidentified officials talking Russian Orthodox Church priests)

Lukyanov

LD1410023889 Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Excerpt] The Soviet vice president has given assurances to an audience gathering to mark 400 years of the Patriarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church that state-church relations would continue positively. Speaking at a meeting in the Kremlin on Friday, Anatoliy Lukyanov expressed satisfaction over greater civic involvement by the Church and believers in asserting common human values, charity and peacemaking. He said the bill on freedom of conscience is soon to come before parliament and thanked the Church for making amendments. [passage omitted]

Further on Lukyanov Meeting

LD1310205189 Moscow TASS in English 2023 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS—Anatoliy Lukyanov, first vice president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met in the Kremlin today with hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church and representatives of other dominations in the Soviet Union.

They expressed profound gratitude to Soviet leaders for the awareness of their needs that is so beneficially influencing the life of the church and inspiring believers in their involvement in the renewal of Soviet society.

Lukyanov congratulated the Russian Orthodox Church on the 400th anniversary of the patriarchate and expressed gratitude and respect for all religious organisations for their contribution to perestroyka and the struggle for peace.

He expressed the hope that religious organisations will continue worthily to fulfil their patriotic, civic and spiritual duty.

Dashichev: Old System 'Doomed To Die'

AU1710214489 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 16 Oct 89 p 2

[Interview with Vyacheslav Dashichev, foreign policy adviser to General Secretary Gorbachev, by Peter Henker in Weikersheim: "Socialist Concept of Power Through the People Has Been Neglected in the GDR"—date not given]

[Text] Professor Vyacheslav Dashichev, influential foreign policy spokesman of the party and government in Moscow, is currently visiting the FRG. Dashichev, 64, is a historian and professor at the Academy of Sciences, where he heads the International Relations Department. The interview with the staunch supporter of perestroyka was conducted by our staff member from Stuttgart, Peter Henkel, after Dashichev's speech at a congress that was sponsored by the "Weikersheim Study Center," which is headed by Hans Filbinger, of the Christian Democratic Union, former minister president of Baden- Wuerthemberg, last weekend [14-15 October].

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: Professor Dashichev, how well do you know your hosts here? Mr Filbinger was once considered in East Europe to be a spearhead of imperialism, revanchism, and cold war.

Dashichev: People change and so do their opinions. Filbinger has delivered a very constructive speech on understanding between East and West. One has to maintain dialogue with all circles, and I have met many reasonable people here in Weikersheim who share our ideas.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: How do you assess the current situation in the GDR?

Dashichev: With its statement of last week, the Politburo of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] took a first step in the right direction. One must never ignore realities. The atmosphere in the population reflects the conditions of the state. If the leadership is not aware of this, it can lead to very dangerous discrepancies between the patterns of thought of the government and the population.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: Nevertheless, most people in the West believe that this discrepancy has existed for 40 years.

Dashichev: I would not say that. One cannot deny that the GDR has achieved a lot since it was founded. However, its entire economic and political system is based on old ideas, on Stalin's concept of administrative socialism. According to this concept it is not the coordination between groups, classes, and interests that prevails, but problems are solved by use of strength and not with political art. Moreover, the population is not involved in leading the state. The socialist concept of power through the people has been neglected in the

GDR, but also in my country and the other socialist countries. Perestroyka aims to eliminate such Stalinist deformations.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: What did Gorbachev tell the SED Politburo during his visit to East Berlin?

Dashichev: He delivered a very sophisticated speech in which he pointed out that reform is inevitable for socialist countries. Does one not have to consider the possibility that if reforms that deserve to be called reforms, were to be introduced, the current GDR leadership would be wiped out, and that this is why it will not introduce such reforms, at least for the time being? In that case one will have to recall what Gorbachev said, namely that life punishes those who do not heed realities. A leadership must be at the head of necessary developments and not lag behind them. This is a simple fact: The old system has not proved successful, it is doomed to die.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: What does socialism mean for you today?

Dashichev: Socialism set out to abolish the exploitation of man. However, it has not eliminated but only taken a different shape. In the USSR, for example, workers who did not do their job well used to live at the expense of others who did. The system of central planning has proved a failure because it paralyzes and binds the entire economy. Modern national economy cannot be centrally controlled.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: What is the alternative?

Dashichev: We will have market economy, decentralize the economy, and introduce forms of mixed ownership, enterprises that are owned by the workers, but also joint stock companies, for example. These have already been legalized.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: And what about the political sphere: Will nonsocialist parties be admitted in elections in the USSR as well?

Dashichev: Yes, it cannot be excluded. There is actually no difference between pluralism of ideas, which we have already accepted, and political pluralism, which is reflected in parties and organizations. Any society is pluralistic by its very nature.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: You do not mind that a nonsocialist is heading the Government in Warsaw?

Dashichev: No, not at all. One can conceive socialism even as a multiparty system. After all, every power monopoly will eventually decay. Lenin already said that.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: Once more: What is it that makes a system a socialist system, according to your concept?

Dashichev: The clear borders between socialism and capitalism, in the old sense of the word, are disappearing. Convergence will lead us to a new society. The concepts of socialism are fundamentally changing. One cannot anticipate what society will look like in the USSR once perestroyka is successfully implemented. One has to liberate oneself from naive and deceptive ideas of communism and socialism. We need more pragmatism. One forgot about man—this was the most serious mistake. Stalin once said: First one has to liberate society, and then man. Yet both things belong together.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: Do you understand that the West European left is worried that its own analysis of capitalism might be buried under the impression of the events in East Europe?

Dashichev: The left in the West is not very well acquainted with our conditions. This is one of the reasons why it has illusions. We will no longer dispense with freedom, equality, and justice. Concepts of the 19th century are no longer applicable today.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU: Are you afraid of a reunified Germany?

Dashichev: No, not at all. The German people themselves must be able to decide on the national question. I am not worried and I have no fears, as long as it will be a democratic and peaceful state. If reunification will be attained at all it will certainly not come very soon.

Academician Calls for Sweeping Economic Reform

AU1610143589 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 13 Oct 89 p 4

[Unattributed NOVOSTI article 'specially for RZECZPOSPOLITA': "The Most Radical Changes Will Take Place After 1991"]

[Text] The most radical changes in the Soviet Union's economy will take place after 1991, stated L. Abalkin, academician, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, and chairman of the State Commission for Economic Reform. He links these changes to the adoption of future legislation on ownership; on land and land utilization; on tenancy and tenancy relationships; on a uniform system of taxation; and new legislation on the socialist enterprise. Applicable draft legislation has already been presented to Parliament for its consideration.

Abalkin considers the renewal of relations of ownership to be the starting point for the next phase of reforms. The logic of the future changes stems from this very point. Presenting the draft legislation, the government was guided by the consideration that the enterprises and their crews should become the real owners of the means of production. The draft legislation on ownership presupposes that the enterprise will own, benefit from, and freely dispose of its property, and perform other activities related to its ownership that are not prohibited by the legislation of the Soviet Union and its constituent republics.

It is not only a matter of enterprise or crew ownership. In the future, the whole socioeconomic system of the Soviet Union ought to be based on a multiplicity of forms of society's and individual citizen's socialist ownership that, on the one hand, will make exploitation impossible and on the other, will not alienate the worker from the means of production. As concerns the question of private ownership, Abalkin supports the appearance of individual employee ownership of the means of production, that is to say, a form of ownership that would exclude hired labor.

Important amendments to the Constitution of the Soviet Union are required before legislation on property ownership can be passed. According to Abalkin, these amendments will primarily touch on state ownership. In its draft legislation the government accepted that individual republic and regional (communal or city) forms of ownership must have equal rights with the nationwide forms of ownership. This is an absolutely critical condition if one wants to lay the foundations for the development of selfgovernment on the republic and regional level, the foundations of regional economic accountability and promote the principle of full authority of councils at all levels. It is exactly here that the close connection of the economic reforms with the reform of the Soviet political system lies.

The government has proposed a fundamental change in the mutual relations between the state and the enterprise, that is to say, the adoption of a uniform taxation system. On the one hand, this will favor raising productivity and the acceleration of scientific and technological progress, and on the other, the creation of a reliable source of income for the state budget. The authors of the draft legislation analyzed various alternatives and in the end opted for a tax on profits. It was accepted that all enterprises, except cooperatives, should be subject to this tax according to a uniform standard, regardless of their subordination, their sector, or the scale of their production. According to calculations, the federal tax will bring the state budget about 35 percent of the profits. Republic and regional taxes are to be fixed at the individual republic and region levels respectively, but the combined sum of the deductions from profits ought not to exceed 60 percent in total.

As regards cooperatives, tax will be payable on their income and not on their profits. According to L. Abalkin, this is the best method, because it takes into account the essential characteristics of the cooperative movement. He assesses the transfer of taxation powers to the individual republics and regional councils as positive.

After preparing the basic draft legislation, the commission, led by L. Abalkin has now embarked on preparing draft legislation on joint stock enterprises; banks; legislation regulating the activities of consortiums; associations and concerns; legislation necessary for the creation of small enterprises; and a discussion of measures necessary to limit monopolistic processes. Additionally, it is intended to introduce a regular practice of situational analysis and the practice of analyzing the effects of implemented decisions.

Academician Abalkin believes that, if Parliament accepts the draft legislation and the initial long-term measures presented by the government, the success of the reforms will then largely depend on how resolute the government is in implementing these proposals. At the same time, the deputy premier of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, hopes that the government—a government that has been chosen by Parliament—will continue to enjoy Parliament's confidence, as in those circumstances it will be ready to accept full responsibility for the decisions it implements.

Culture, Education Official Interviewed

90UN0070A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 10 Oct 89 p 2

[Report on interview with A.N. Medvedev, head of the Department of Culture and National Education of the USSR Council of Ministers, by SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent Vil. Niyazmatov, Moscow: "I Realize the Responsibility..."; date and occasion not specified]

[Text] One more department, the Department of Culture and National Education of the USSR Council of Ministers, has just appeared in the structural subdivisions of the government. Its head has been confirmed. It is A.N. Medvedev who worked as the first deputy chairman of USSR Goskino [State Committee for Cinematography]. We call the attention of our readers to our correspondent's interview with him.

[Niyazmatov] Armen Nikolayevich, first of all, a few words about the "competence" of the department that has been established.

[Medvedev] The initial position of the department was set in the very idea of forming such a structural subdivision in the country's governmental apparatus. Hence, the program of our department is to focus the attention of the government on the cardinal problems of cultural construction in the country. My first acquaintance with the mail, which until recently arrived at the Bureau for Social Development, proves once again that the area of culture requires daily attention in literally all directions. And so we are faced with the task of covering the entire flow of information that comes from various regions of the country and to formulate it, when this is required, into a governmental decision. In my view, this is the first task facing the department. The second task is to contribute in every possible way to the realization of the creative initiative of social organizations and citizens of the country who want to make a contribution to the development of culture.

The third task, which troubles us, is the problem of developing interethnic cultural ties. Today, when the national republics are acquiring independence in the resolution of socioeconomic questions, the problem of the vital unity of the culture of our peoples (not formal unity as it frequently was previously, not contrived, and not dictated by somebody from above) and the strengthening of ties between them comes to the forefront as never before.

[Niyazmatov] What, in your opinion, will be the relationships of the department with various offices and ministries?

[Medvedev] I would add, with public organizations and creative unions. We assume that the department will cooperate in the closest way with about 30 state offices, with social and scientific organizations, and with creative unions. A clear boundary will be drawn in relations with them. What constitutes questions at a governmental level, and what will be decided directly by the branches, offices, and creative collectives themselves, etc. We intend to do everything that legally promotes decentralization and the independence of our creative organizations.

[Niyazmatov] What do you see as the interaction between the department of the USSR Council of Ministers and related committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet?

[Medvedev] In three words: closer operational ties. Personally, I sensed from the very start that there was a need for communicating with the deputies. The first such meeting was with members of the commission headed by Chingiz Aytmatov. We frequently note a frightful situation in culture which resulted when central state authority monopolized all questions of cultural construction. The pernicious results of such an approach are present today. And the subject of our conversation with members of the Supreme Soviet commission will be: What first steps have to be undertaken to begin an improvement in culture and national education.

[Niyazmatov] You moved into this chair from the chair of the first deputy chairman of Goskino. How do you perceive this "falling out?"

[Medvedev] It would be incorrect to call it a "falling out." The cinema will always remain my first "love." The cinema gave me everything in life that I have today, and my former attachment to it will not be a hindrance in my new post.

[Niyazmatov] Do you not have a feeling that you did not succeed in doing something important and planned for cinema, being that you were one of the managers of Goskino and, pardon me, a high official?

[Medvedev] I literally became an official on the threshold of perestroyka. Here is the way it used to be: The fate of our cinematographer depended on a "yes" or a "no" of any manager. I came to the firm conclusion that the participation of the state in the development of culture will also be necessary from now on so that culture does not become a victim of the market elements. On the other hand, the state organs should, even to the detriment of their own functions and to their own rights, give free range to the development of culture by the forces of all social organizations. And more—many have nothing to do with the expression "culture and state order." In my view, this is an error. A state order in the sphere of culture is patronage of the arts in the best sense of the word on the part of the state. It is support of talent and support of the beginning artist. I was not able to develop this thesis to the end in Goskino. I want to resolve this in my new post on a broader plane.

[Niyazmatov] A few words about yourself.

[Medvedev] I am 51 years of age. I gave 30 years to the cinema. I began my work activity after graduating from VGIK [All-Union State Order of the Red Banner Institute of Cinematography] as a methodologist in the bureau of propaganda in the USSR Cinematographer Union. I am lucky to have presented to viewers the world famous Romm, Yutkevich, Pyrev, and other leading lights in Soviet art. This was an excellent school for me. Afterwards I went into journalism. I edited the journals SOVETSKIY FILM and ISKUSSTVO KINO... Now I am "making myself at home" in this office. I understand the responsibility that has now been placed on me very well. I will try not to disappoint those who entrusted me with such responsible work.

People's Front's Kagarlitskiy Grants Interview

PM1810111289 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 15-16 Oct 89 p 12

[Interview with Moscow People's Front leader Boris Kagarlitskiy by Nicola Lombardozzi in Rome on 14 October]

[Text] Rome—"Gorbachev is going too far. In the USSR there is no longer any threat of a right-wing coup. These are all fabrications designed to justify the repression of the new dissent, to allow unjust and authoritarian measures. The real great danger to the Soviet Union is precisely this new power apparatus." Boris Kagarlitskiy, a 32-year-old sociologist, one of the founders of Moscow's People's Front, summed up in a few sentences the line pursued by his movement—no longer a "critical supporter" of Gorbachev's new course but a fully-fledged opponent. The front has already established a committee for the formation of a new socialist party ("just like Hungary's") and another of the organization's creations is fully active among the miners of Siberia and Kazakhstan: the USSR's first independent trade union, which seems determined to pay little heed to the Kremlin's pressing appeals for caution.

Kagarlitskiy, who was guest of the Proletarian Democratic Party's national leadership in Rome yesterday, explained that it is the past 5 months that brought about the Front's swing. In his opinion during these 5 months the Soviet leadership group has radically changed course and entrenched itself in "dangerous defensive positions." Imprisoned under Brezhnev for editing a samizdat publication, and now with his great passion for environmental issues and membership in the first environmentalist and "Eurocommunist" groups, Kagarlitskiy describes himself as a spokesman for a widespread dissatisfaction that is increasing particularly among young people who had hoped to obtain immediate and definitive changes from the new course. "We want everything right away," 22-year-old journalist Dmitriy Radishevskiy wrote in the latest issue of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, revealing the new generations' haste and mistrust.

[Lombardozzi] Do you agree with Radishevskiy? Do you really believe that it is possible to proceed with the reforms without a certain degree of caution?

[Kagarlitskiy] It is not a matter of continuing reforms. It is virtually a matter of starting from scratch. It is the whole of society that must be refounded. The leadership group is creating an intermediate situation between the old Leninist model and a vague liberal-type blueprint. This hybrid can only bring disastrous consequences.

[Lombardozzi] What kind of consequences?

[Kagarlitskiy] Let us consider the easiest example, namely, that relating to privatization. The state tells us that we must accept it as a necessary evil in order to salvage the economy. But foreign multinationals will bring us—and in some cases have already brought us—dirty and obsolete technology that will create environmental disasters and that can in any case only provide us with prospects of Third World-type development. You will see that this is what will happen in Hungary and Poland, too.

[Lombardozzi] Are there any alternatives?

[Kagarlitskiy] We have included in the new socialist party's platform the concept of municipal ownership, which would permit close monitoring. But above all it would enable people to manage work and production directly. These are the incentives that workers are demanding.

[Lombardozzi] Do you mean that there is a demand for self-management?

[Kagarlitskiy] Certainly. Western models cannot be used for our people. During the miners' strike in September people were not at all concerned about pay increases. They preferred by far to work under better conditions and if possible to have guarantees of more free time. The technocrats now in power take no account of people's requirements, culture, and habits.

[Lombardozzi] Do you believe that self-management could resolve the eternal problem of the quality and quantity of production?

[Kagarlitskiy] I went to Karaganda during the great strike. People said that things had never worked as well as during those days of obligatory self-management. They said: "Gorbachev should leave things to us." Now they are disillusioned again. In Prokofyev and Vorkuta people are already considering another strike.

[Lombardozzi] Disillusioned with what?

[Kagarlitskiy] With the promises that Gorbachev made just to end the strikes—but that he then failed to honor.

[Lombardozzi] The president is still urging caution, however. Listing the recent emergency measures, he warned of the threat of a rise of the Right.

[Kagarlitskiy] I will permit myself to draw the following paradoxical comparison: Stalin, too, was always talking about the enemies of communism in order to justify his most repressive decisions.

[Lombardozzi] You are not saying that there are no enemies of perestroyka in the USSR?

[Kagarlitskiy] There are, but they are insignificant. Pamyat was destroyed in the recent elections. The Stalinists are finished. The most conservative members of the apparatus are the present leadership group's most loyal supporters.

[Lombardozzi] Really?

[Kagarlitskiy] Obviously they do not approve of everything, but they tell themselves: "It could be worse with someone else." In any case, the revolt in Georgia, for instance, was suppressed in Tbilisi by means of tanks and troops—just as a conservative regime would have done.

[Lombardozzi] Your People's Front has only 1,500 members in Moscow. This is not many, compared to the great strength of the fronts in the Baltic republics and Georgia. What kind of relations do you maintain?

[Kagarlitskiy] Difficult. In those countries the nationalist cause has overtaken the political aspect. And the fronts are sponsored by the same bureaucratic apparatuses that represent our opposite. Basically we pursue different objectives. We are neutral with regard to their demands. Be that as it may, we believe that every decision must be determined by the people's direct vote.

[Lombardozzi] But will 1,500 members not be too few to achieve concrete results?

[Kagarlitskiy] There were at least 200,000 people at our latest rally. Some 5,000 workers have already joined the independent trade union. In the Moscow elections we contributed to Yeltsin's great success by granting him our "critical support" against Gorbachev. Furthermore we also had our own candidate, Stankevich, elected.

Within the CPSU we have formed the "Communists for socialism" club which includes several left-wing figures. This seems to me enough for us to consider ourselves an opposition movement. This is a signal that the party should acknowledge.

Deputy Sobchak Views Interregional Group Future

PM0410145089 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 40, 1 Oct 89 p 2

[Interview with People's Deputy Anatoliy Sobchak by Gennadiy Zhavoronkov: "Inter-Regional Group"; date, place not given]

[Text] People's Deputy Anatoliy Sobchak told MN correspondent Gennadiy Zhavoronkov his views on the question of this group's existence.

[Zhavoronkov] The Inter-Regional Deputies Group met in Moscow on September 23-24. But opinions on the expedience of the very creation of such a group were divided in the first session. You apparently had your own, special view on this.

[Sobchak] I don't think you can call it special. I actively supported this idea. But from the very first minutes I spoke against the group becoming a faction, an opposition force, and suggested it remain a sort of deputies' club, open to all, where it would be possible to exchange opinions, elaborate alternative draft laws and accelerate the settlement of urgent problems.

We're taking only the first steps in setting up a new parliamentary system and I think that it is too early for the concept of a faction, or an opposition. In the countries which have a parliamentary history it is quite normal for an opposition force to make itself felt in political life. But in conditions of our one- party system, with only a nascent parliament, a unity of views and a definite platform are more important. In general, I think it is a mistake to pose the question of the opposition of the Inter-Regional Deputies Group vis-a-vis other deputies.

[Zhavoronkov] What future do you envisage for the Inter-Regional Group? Some people say it is the parliament of tomorrow. Others see it as a destructive force which may hinder the development of democracy.

[Sobchak] We shouldn't fear the Inter-Regional Group. It needs cooperation, its own press for feedback to its voters. If it matures, it could help perestroika and become a counter-weight to conservative forces in the Party, the government and the Supreme Soviet itself. But some people think it could become an association of not very responsible people, if it starts proposing only ultimatums, instead of giving the majority in the Supreme Soviet the most professional models for dealing with complex problems.

I think that the activities of the Inter-Regional Group will be judged not by words, but by its positive contribution to the acceleration of perestroika. We have all made so many errors, we don't have the right to make more.

Baklanov Explains Scientific Production

LD1510185189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Oct 89

[S. Slipchenko video report from Kaliningrad about a visit by future industrial and agricultural managers and party workers, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [S. Slipchenko, identified by caption] Yachts, saucepans, refrigerators, televisions alongside missiles and satellites. What do they have in common? All these things are made by the same enterprises out of the same materials. If there are fewer missiles, then there will be more saucepans and refrigerators: Unfortunately, that's the logic of many people in our country. It can now be affirmed that an incorrect public opinion has taken shape regarding conversion and the possibilities of the country's defense complex in the matter of filling the store shelves with goods. It's customary to believe that one only has to transfer money, to reallocate it, and the problem will be almost resolved. This is all wrong. At the scientific production association Komposit in Kaliningrad near Moscow the future industrial and agricultural managers and party cadres—the reserve of perestroyka, as they now say—became convinced that the national economy is simply unreceptive to scientific and technological progress at present, whereas the defense complex is not only taking the latest developments but is also advancing progress, as it were. Our ideas are followed better abroad than here.

Composite materials: for a long time they have been used in the manufacture of deflectors, missile bodies, antennas, carbon plastics, organoplastics, such as you simply don't find anywhere else. They are all light, durable, reliable, and almost everlasting. But they are in aircraft and missiles, not in our everyday lives. Why? There is a phrase: Industrial training. This is what makes industry flexible, what allows it to restructure itself and produce new output. In our works it amounts to 5-10 percent of capacity, in the defense complex more than 30 percent. In leading world firms it is between 20 and 50 percent. Hence the diversity of goods in the stores abroad.

[Unidentified man] According to published data, the profit obtained from space research last year, 1988, was R2 billion. Less than R1.7 billion was spent and an income of R2 billion was obtained.

[Slipchenko] You can't tell of all the problems in one report. One thing is clear: Society must urgently change its attitude to science, both basic and applied science. There will be no leap forward in industry without introducing everything which has been accumulated and which has been shown here. And the main thing is that industry should not leave on the shelf what we have that is up to the world standard and higher, but should absorb it. Centralized planning of progress has not produced results, and the party, the Academy of Sciences, and the Council of Ministers have already begun work on fundamentally raising the standard of technology and science.

The guests wre told this by Baklanov, CPSU Central Committee secretary, Marchuk, USSR Academy of Sciences president, and Laverov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology. [Video shows officials inspecting works, exhibition on manufactured items, baklanov et alia on rostrum in auditorium]

Discusses Electronics Industry Problems

LD1310222389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1834 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 13 Oct (TASS)—Oleg Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited a scientific center of the electronics industry today in Zelenograd a satellite town near Moscow. This center has a decisive role in the accelerated development of the whole electronics industry. That is why it is impossible to allow here even the smallest lag in the fulfillment of the set tasks. However, the situation that has been created today give rise to concern.

There was a robust conversation about the most imnportant problems. Directors of enterprises, scientists, secretaries of the party committees, and chairmen of the soviets of the labor collectives took part in it. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee took note of the need for more strict and, what is most important, regular monitoring of the fulfillment of the decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on the urgent measures for speeding up the development of the electronic industry that was adopted 1 and ½ years ago. He stressed the importance of solving social and consumer problems together with the construction of the industrial areas, as a package. The necessary measures to eliminate the lag have been defined.

On Defense Enterprise Conversion

PM1610101589 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Sep 89 p 1

[LenTASS report: "Stay in Leningrad"]

[Text] On 29 September O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, currently visiting the city on the Neva, acquainted himself with the work of a number of enterprises and institutions in defense industry sectors, including the Central Scientific Research Institute named for Academician A.N. Krylov. Questions connected with the most effective utilization in the interests of the people of capacities which are becoming available as a result of conversion were discussed. The subject of discussion was the maximum acceleration of these processes with a view to saturating the domestic market with consumer goods.

Special attention was paid to the solution of labor collectives' social problems and problems connected with everyday life. The importance of the utilization of economic levers to enhance labor productivity and increase the output of high-quality goods was stressed. The improvement of the economy is an indispensable precondition of enhancing all aspects of people's lives.

O.D. Baklanov, accompanied by the leaders of a number of enterprises, visited the construction site of a housing complex which is being built by the "Zavod 'Bolshevik'" association by means of the direct labor method. It was noted that this progressive construction method should be given all-around support and attention.

Taking part in the discussion of the problems were USSR Ministers B.M. Belousov, I.V. Koksanov, V.I. Shimko, and O.N. Shishkin; N.M. Luzhin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Defense Department; and other senior party and economic leaders.

O.D. Baklanov was accompanied by B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Oblast Committee.

On the same day O.D. Baklanov departed for Moscow. City and oblast leaders saw him off at Pulkovo airport.

Aping of West, 'Russophobia' Deplored

PM1710153989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

["Polemical Reflections" by Vladimir Lichutin: "They Do Not Seek Happiness Elsewhere"; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Excerpts] The attention of the broad reading public has now been attracted by Vladimir Lichutin's novels "Wanderers" and "Lyubostay," which have been nominated for the USSR State Prize. Our correspondent V. Ogryzko's conversation with the writer began with this question: What prompted him to turn to history and what, above all, induced him to write "Wanderers"? We publish Vladimir Lichutin's answers below. It should be noted that they are of a profoundly personal nature and were arrived at through suffering, and they certainly do not coincide in all respects with the editors' opinion. [Passage omitted]

The difficulty of the situation is that, although Man is proclaimed as the basis of the deeds of perestroyka, he appears once again in the plans of reorganization [perestroyka] as the lever, the energy, the bullock who is promised prosperity and entertainment in return for his work. Hence the great many mistakes over the 4 years of changes. Again the plea for help is directed not to the individual tormented soul but to everyone at once: The people have become an agitated mob greedy for leaders [vozhdi] and prophets who are aware of the hot and intoxicating force of false yet recklessly uttered words. The voice of a lone person is once again inaudible....

You ask: What are we to do, and where are we to go? I am no prophet, sorcerer, or soothsayer. But, fortunately for me, I myself am in control of my tiny little mind, and I understand that there is a single free place in the world—my own soul. This suggests to me the main obstacles on the future path.

We must soberly evaluate our place in the world and our purpose. Either we are economic dictators (still a raw materials colony) or we are confessors, the moral guides of mankind, who have directed our hearts toward stoic rejection of the total power of the Ruble. Forecasters are now making a lot of noise, promising us ruin, a place among those bringing up the rear of the world column, and so forth. I would like to ask our unknown opponent, the newfound left-wing radical (a former Brezhnevite): When were you frank? In the times of Khrushchev, when you were suggesting how to urgently catch up with America in respect of milk and meat? Or during the rule of Brezhnev, when you undertook a new resettlement of the people and tore the masses of the people deprived of rights away from their long-standing homes with promises of benefits, when you cut the achilles tendons of mother nature? Or are you being frank now, having easily brushed aside your former transgressions, and once again advising us to catch up with America, for otherwise.... Curious variations of people changing their spots.... A reversible coat was once invented; very practical for poor people. Today you wear a checked coat, tomorrow you turn it inside out, and you wear a striped coat. These people remind me of those coats for the poor. An academician economist was asked recently: "Were you also to blame for stagnation, for you created the stagnant economy?" And he replied without a second's hesitation, honestly looking millions of people in the eyes: "You know, we intellectuals are modest people, and it was diffidence that let us down...."

My dears, conscience is given you at birth, with your mother's milk. You either have it or you do not. Conscience is closely tied up with national ethics by indissoluble bonds.... So, before rushing with lance lowered into a new joust with an unknown enemy (for pursuit is a duel), it is necessary first to foster national ethics, which includes the whole of truly national life: The time has come to recall it from scratch, selecting what is most valuable.

I believe that a people who respect themselves need not catch up to anyone: It is possible to catch up only by yourself—by facing your own history.

Imagine, I, a small person, wish to shout my tiny heartfelt word to the whole country or warn of the insanity which is once again overtaking us, and exclaim: I wish to remain a Russian (Armenian, Georgian, and so forth), I do not want to resemble an American, despite all his shiny packaging and so sated present life. Let me live like a Russian!

For it was commanded of yore: Every country has its own customs; a foreign law does not come to another country, but each country keeps the law of its own custom. Something is adopted from the outside world only if it enables you to fill out and deepen what you have acquired over the centuries; everything else is tinsel, sequins, carnival leftovers which are crammed into the bin along with the garbage.

So where are we to find a mouthpiece in order to shout a heartfelt word to the whole country? No, we will end up with just a shout to the crowd, while the warning cry to the crazed baying mob wanting circuses is a cry in the muteness of night in a paneled kitchen. All mouthpieces have been seized by those who have turned their reversible coats inside out: Outwardly they seem to have the same eyes and nose, but they are now quite different, striped. Sheltering behind democracy and the slogans of the beginning of the century, they are ordering our life according to their own mentality and nature and swaddling us in their habits.

Brought up in the bowels of stagnation, full (so it turns out) of a different way of speaking and double thinking, able to stand cleverly on two banks at once, having chosen Radio Liberty as their platform, and preaching nihilism, what particular happiness can they find for Russia elsewhere? The first poisonous flowers of the left-wing radicals' new economic policy have grown up on the crest of economic sabotage, about which they now endeavor to keep quiet. Without having prepared conditions for the New Market or for wholesale trade, they proclaimed cooperatives as a panacea: A rapid transfer of goods began from the state granaries to secret cellars, and weak natures were soon corrupted by easy money. Hence the double-dyed speculation and the secondhand dealers who disdain everyone. A weak heart, alas, easily yields to corruption... But, it turns out, armchair economists who have earned all their ranks and position by exposing capitalism now wish to sell Russia on a half-and-half basis, believing this to be a charitable act by the West, to sell it out, to carve it up into zones and appanage principalities, and to dig up and shovel it away to please the Ruble, traveling across the ocean and dutifully listening to prompts. Never before has there been such a lot of lewd thinking, lewd talk, envy of everything foreign, festive forfeits, alluring pictures, and advertising of the female body: Well, Russian women have always been renowned for their beauty, but is this a good commodity to be sold around the world, messieurs intellectuals? Pressed caviar and furs are far more profitable. Have courage, gentlemen....

In general, there are strange transmutations with our lovers of freedom. The newspaper print has not yet had time to turn yellow from those days when they proclaimed our leader to the whole world as a miracle man, the country's No 1 man, yet they are already trying on the sly to pull the chair out from under the leader of perestroyka and are measuring up a new president for it.

Games, games, games: The country is gradually being turned into a soccer pitch where 22 theoreticians sportively control the state's destiny. And yet the raison d'etre of public institutions—and this is why the people maintain them—is to imperceptibly yet confidently watch over their mores and to maintain calm. Otherwise who are they for? But the institutions of power now prefer to sit imperceptibly on rostrums with their wards, that is to say, with the people, and to observe with a feeling of doom this tragicomic game.

Russophobia has once again flowered now, which means that envy of everything foreign—the reverse side of this coin—is once again current. I would like to hope that Russophobia will cease to be a secret state weapon, as it was under Stalin. It is generally a unique phenomenon when the state itself consistently devours its own backbone, depriving a gigantic people of its history and countenance. Nihilists have now relit the beckoning lights over the swampy mires, luring the people into quagmires and promising for the umpteenth time "heavenly" delights on earth, and people who are tired of eternal shortages have set out spellbound toward the lights, as yet ignorant of their downfall.

Here I do not mean the West, for replete people—but people who dream of being still more replete—have raced each other to get there posthaste: Sausage mirages give them no rest, but the chipolata skyscrapers are far sweeter for them than Russia, which is half exhausted in endless pursuit. Well let them go. Freedom for the free, paradise for the saved. It is true that everyone is free to like or dislike another people: Love cannot be compelled, SO go to replete reality where you can dream of a gray "calico" land. It is far easier to dream than to live making an effort to swaddle your modest land in silks.

But if you publicly broadcast your dislike of the people who give you food and drink, this means that you introduce the poison of irritation and unbelief into the flushed body of society. This is a policy of destruction. [passage omitted]

Economist Repudiates 'Brezhnev Doctrine'

PM1510133589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Doctor of Economic Sciences Viktor Sheynis article under the rubric "The World and We": "August Harvest"]

[Text] Moscow—With three brief interviews on the events which developed during the night of 20-21 August 1968 IZVESTIYA (No 232) finally broached one of the most taboo and hitherto untouched topics in recent history. Things that happened in days not so long past are described by people who participated in them in different ways. A once influential politician who was privy to the adoption of key decisions and under another name directed the actions of the troops who unexpectedly descended upon the capital of a friendly state. A retired military chief, a "man of convictions" who does not change his views. A former soldier, a forced participant in events. Three people, two positions... Both the article itself and the responses to it published a little later on (No 259) attest that we cannot escape a reinterpretation of those distant events if we want to be totally honest.

However, August 1968 is a very important landmark in the history not only of Czechoslovakia but also of the USSR. It completed the turn begun in October 1964 with the ouster of Khrushchev and ended the 4-year transitional period when there was still a possibility, albeit one that was diminishing year by year, of an alternative development underpinned by the positive elements which had accumulated during the first post-Stalin decade. The small "October coup" had not yet ruled out the possibility of progressive changes in the economy, culture, and official ideology.

By 1968 the situation had changed radically. "Voluntarism" and "subjectivism," in the struggle against which the opponents of Khrushchev's course had rallied, had been stashed away at the back of the political vocabulary, and a front had been deployed resolutely against "revisionism." The fear and bitterness with which they began painting the picture of this old and new enemy would be totally inexplicable if this had been a response just to the disposition of forces in our countries at that time.

In conceiving and carrying out the invasion of Czechoslovakia, our leadership relied on the formula which became known as the "Brezhnev doctrine." With this the then Soviet leadership and its closest allies established their incontestable right and duty to decide what accorded with the interests of socialism and what threatened them and to defend those interests in any country by all the means at their disposal. They undoubtedly identified the interests of socialism with the conservation of the economic, political, and ideological structures which had arisen in the USSR under Stalin and been reproduced with minor modifications in the majority of East European states. The very idea of seeking new models of socialism and democratizing and humanizing social relations, models absorbing the experience and achievements of social development in the West, was deemed pernicious. In the complex and long-term political game Brezhnev and his colleagues calculated precisely one move ahead. The move seemed successful: In a comparatively short time the social situation in Czechoslovakia was returned to the usual order, and the price that had to be paid for that at first appeared quite modest. This was encouraging. Now the experience acquired could be applied in their own country (and subsequently extended to Afghanistan too). True, the situation in the USSR was quite different: The political system created under Stalin still had a colossal reserve of strength, and a public movement independent of the authorities was still in the incubation period. But a very simple conclusion was drawn from this: The mechanisms for conserving and suppressing must be started up in good time and at pretty full power.

The "Prague spring" had received boosts from two directions: The reforms, which corresponded to the mood in society, had been declared from above and immediately taken up from below. The people's movement had begun to organize itself quickly inside and outside official structures. The counterstrategy flowed from this: To put a resolute end to all reforms which might shake the administrative-edict system and to nip in the bud any uncontrolled public activeness.

The economy was one of the first things to be sacrificed. In fact, the 1965 reform itself had been implemented in a cut-down version. In it everyone found what they were interested in: The organs of economic management found a strengthening of centralized leadership, and the executants found a broadening of enterprises' rights. That duality over 2-3 years theoretically preserved the possibilities of development in opposite directions. After 1968 the question was decided unequivocally: They began vigorously curtailing the reform, which they perceived as being analogous with the plans of O. Sik and other Czechoslovak economists.

On the theoretical level the sensible idea that the market is an objective economic reality and that the plan, as an expression of subjective will, must proceed from this objective reality began to be ousted by ideological tenets [ideologemy] according to which the market and the law of value under socialism are just tools of the plan, a belittling of the state's economic role should be feared most of all, and on no account should a free choice of partners by enterprises, competition, contract price formation, commercial credit, and so forth be permitted. Everything that is making agonizing headway today in an immeasurably more difficult socioeconomic situation was raised for discussion and decisively rejected as "a loss of socialism's advantages."

These propaganda battles raged on the surface. In practical terms, the new approach toward managing the economy was replaced by updated plan and reporting indicators. One after another, enterprises were deprived of the few rights which had granted to them. They were simply not given stable long-term plans: The ministries acted as bosses, assigning additional targets to some and making life easier for others. Wholesale trade failed to develop: The money credited to enterprises' accounts meant nothing in the conditions of rationing in resource distribution. Prices were "regulated" every now and then, but the mechanism of arbitrary price formation remained intact. Like the wild ass' skin, the profits left at enterprises' disposal kept shrinking; although they were the main incentive conceived by the economic reform, any "spare residue" was expropriated by ministries before it was even determined whether it was actually "spare." Finally, the reform did not reach any higher than enterprise level even in draft form: Nothing but administrative reshuffles occurred at higher levels, while obliging political economists hastened to substantiate the contention that "scientific administrative methods for managing the economy are simultaneously economic methods." This kind of theoretical balderdash flourished even more luxuriantly as the economy's disintegration increased with every new 5-year plan.

Given these circumstances, is it any wonder that when the golden rain of petrodollars descended upon us out of the blue (some R176 billion in foreign currency was earned from the export of energy sources in 1976-1984), these resources were simply squandered: We did not put any money on deposit with international banks like the Arab monarchies, nor did we effect a structural perestroyka of the economy like Indonesia. We could have done with these funds today as a built-in stabilizer for profound economic reform...

In politics, the criticism of the "personality cult" launched under Khrushchev was not quite a reform, but a very important prerequisite for one. This term, however—singling out from among the numerous manifestations of Stalinism's socioeconomic and political system a feature which was certainly ugly but was only superficial and essentially one of the least harmful—diverted attention from the heart of the matter. It was back in Khrushchev's time and in the first few years following his ouster that repeated attempts were made to contain public discussions of our history within the permitted limits and to stop any deeper movement which would have inevitably raised the question of the political system and its reform. The partial—albeit important—question of appraising Stalin's personality and historical role time and again led to the core problem: the legitimacy of Stalin's legacy and, in addition, the correlation between Stalinism, socialism, and the requirements of modern development.

The disappearance of the magic aura surrounding the symbols could have easily led to the loss of ideological control, collapse of the bogus unanimity, and ideological pluralism followed by political pluralism. Therefore—and not only because of the personal likes and dislikes of the new leaders—the old gods headed by the generalissimo had to be put back on the empty pedestals, while society's historical awareness had to be thrown right back to the starting point.

After a brief break, Stalin started returning to the pages of memoirs and literary works, plays, and movies (ranging from the multipart war movie "Liberation" to the popular television series "17 Moments in Spring") as strict but fair, as an eminent troop leader and perspicacious diplomat. It was not in vain, the poet wrote, that back in March 1953 "thousands of trampled compatriots formed a funeral wreath." Mentions of the "cult" were increasingly deleted, crimes were downgraded to errors, and errors were justified by extenuating circumstances. Articles commemorating jubilee anniversaries of executed party figures no longer mentioned the cause of their death. Rehabilitations were stopped, while in some cases (like that of F. Raskolnikov) they were even "reversed." Along with Stalin, attempts were made to whitewash his cronies like Zhdanov and Shcherbakov, while in 1970 the city of Lugansk was given again the name of Voroshilov which it had lost earlier.

Of course, the "cult" was not fully restored; the top leadership could hardly have seriously set itself this task. But the myth of Stalin grew and captivated the rising generations both because a ban had been imposed on any public analysis of our past, and as a reaction rejecting the obvious hypocrisy of official propaganda, which persistently slipped the new leaders in among the heroes of revolution and war. The ideological campaigns which followed one after another made a considerable contribution toward the disorientation and demoralization of society, implanting in many people's minds—on the one hand—a distorted image of the past, a cult of force, and a scornful attitude toward civil liberties and the millions of victims who lost their lives along the path that had been traveled, and—on the other hand—disbelief in any ideals at all, immorality, and antisocial aspirations. The price of the enforced "unanimity" could not have been any different. And we are paying that price to this day.

Sundry "zones" and "risk groups" were singled out—the press, the theater, the movies, the scientific and creative intelligentsia, and the students.

One is constantly amazed on leafing through newspapers, journals, and scientific literature from the late sixties and early seventies: How cautious, restrained, and loyal were the overwhelming majority of society's attempts to speak up for itself and to take on responsibility, not yet in solving, but just in discussing its gradually emerging problems; how insignificant were the deviations from customary "ideological discipline" and how swiftly were they followed by suppression in response; how quickly the fortifications and casemates along the "front of ideological struggle" were being renewed and reinforced.

Writers were taken to task "for losing a sense of the real proportion between the bright and dark aspects of our life, for despondency and trivial subject matter," and movie directors "for mindless modernization of the classics." No sooner had the Theater on Taganka staged Brecht's "Life of Galileo" or the Central Theater of the Soviet Army "The Death of Ivan the Terrible" than they were accused of following "a fashionable trend of deheroization of strong personalities." The tone became harsher with the passage of time, and the fire of unscrupulous criticism was targeted, one after the other, on honest works created in past years.

Some were blamed for their "extremely grating" works depicting "life in the trenches," others for "intellectualism eroding all social horizons and passions." Some writers, critics, moviemakers, and painters had "lost sight of the correct guidelines, at times mistaking capitulationism for breadth of vision and revisionist distortions for breadth of thought"! This was no longer acceptable—and barriers were erected between these irresponsible writers and the readers, many innovative movies ended up on the shelves, and works by painters who were "alien to the people" were swept away by bulldozers. The compilers of the Literary Encyclopedia were condemned because it "coquettishly quotes Spanish bourgeois philosopher Ortega y Gasset" and because they had underhandedly attempted to revise the appraisal of Pilnyak's work (against whom they held the praise of Trotskiy). They were reproached for the fact that the list of NOVYY MIR authors in the encyclopedia was "incredibly inflated" and that it said more about V. Nekrasov than about G. Markov and A. Alekseyev.

As a matter of fact, ideological means were by no means the only ones employed in the struggle against the "revisionist danger." The August operation untied their hands and sharply changed ideas about the limits of what was allowed. Seeing that it was possible to introduce troops in a foreign country and force that country to change its leadership and course, what was there to prevent taking NOVYY MIR out of the hands of Tvardovskiy and his editorial board and swamping all the other tiny islands of the semi-free press? In 1969, in time for the October Revolution anniversary, Solzhenitsyn had already been expelled from the Writers Union by his own fellow writers, and was afterwards exiled from the country. "The poverty of anticommunism" was all they could find to say when the writer was awarded the Nobel Prize.

Energetic work was also being done by the CPSU Central Committee Science Department, which was headed by S. Trapeznikov, whom Leonid Ilich had "personally" spotted while working in Moldavia. During the "liberal" times he had been voted down in elections to the Academy of Sciences. Now he published the work "At Sharp Turns in History," which falsified party history and geared the cadres under his command up to struggle against the main, age-old enemy—revisionism. They took on the demolition of scientific collectives which had taken the first steps toward the revival of genuine social science. The History Institute, where "the specific nature of Russia's historical development is absolutized," where attempts were being made to investigate the consequences of Stalin's collectivization, and which had underestimated "the party's activity in preparations for war." The Sociological Research Institute, which, "not without the influence of bourgeois sociology," had started groping toward the real social structure in our country and conducting public opinion studies without aiming for predetermined results, and had even dared to publish futurological material without special permission. At the same time, the Tartu University Sociology Laboratory, which was functioning at a high level of professionalism, was closed down. A special resolution was promulgated on the Economics Institute to ensure that people there did not encroach on basic ideological principles, yet now we ask ourselves: What was economic science doing at the time?

Awakened by the course of events, but vigorously squeezed out of all state institutions and publications, free social thought moved onto a different plane. The late sixties and early seventies were marked by a massive flood of "samizdat" and "tamizdat" [foreign-published] works and by attempts to establish direct contacts with society bypassing official channels. The authorities responded by activating the repressive apparatus, stepping up political investigations, and arbitrarily applying on a large scale Articles 70 and 190(1) of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Criminal Code and corresponding articles in the codes of other union republics, which were anticonstitutional in spirit and in letter. The specter of of "ideological subversion," an invention of Stalin's which revived medieval images of "corruption" brought upon mankind by the devil, was revived in political vocabulary.

In order to repulse "ideological aggression," there was thorough coordination of the activity of party committees and state security organs, which, as in the past, were increasingly diverted from their proper work, and of the courts and special psychiatric hospitals, which rigorously followed instructions from the former.

Of course, the scale of repressions was far smaller than it was under Stalin, but the mechanism was completely restored and, furthermore, was raised to modern organizational and technical standards. At any moment, as the center chose, it could be cranked up to any speed.

Having moved troops into Czechoslovakia, the Brezhnev-Suslov leadership immediately organized in its own country a vocal campaign of "nationwide support." Following the established scenario, workers, peasants, scientists, and writers not only unanimously raised their hands at rallies attended by thousands, but also hastened to speak up in the press and on radio and television. Here is a curious detail: The very first news reports on the operation which had been undertaken were followed by Collective Farm Chairman Adylov's response over the telephone. The hour of his scandalous notoriety was yet to come, but in the meantime he hastened, on behalf of people under his charge, to approve the "assistance to the fraternal Czechoslovak people" and to brand the "reactionaries and their instigators from the imperialist camp."

The cruel lesson of Afghanistan was yet to come.

A totally conformist attitude was also shown by that section of the people and the intelligentsia which realized the meaning of events and could have estimated their consequences. But, as V. Turchin eloquently demonstrated, the inertia of fear operated impeccably in the overwhelming majority of cases. Having accepted the deed, the mass of the "20th congress generation" proved fragmented and helpless, at best taking comfort in nonparticipation. This is one of the gravest lessons of August.

In the summer of 1968 our state and society found themselves once more at a historical crossroads—and moved into a blind alley. Neo-Stalinism extended its domination by almost 2 more decades. And the further we advanced along the path chosen at that time, the more acute and painful problems accumulated, the more dangerous the atrophy and malignant degeneration of the social organism's crucial cells became, and the more surely we condemned ourselves to a comprehensive crisis of the economy, society, ideology, and morality with unpredictable consequences.

The past, which is still with us and has yet to be overcome, is like fetters around our feet and has us in a dead man's grip. S. Kondrashov is profoundly correct: "Whenever violence is done to history and the people's will, it will sooner or later have to be paid for—and the later this happens, the harsher the settlement." This is a rule to which there are no exceptions. But, in addition to the general principle, there are at least three direct reasons why the truth about the invasion of Czechoslovakia is vitally necessary for us today, along the difficult path of perestroyka.

First, it is impossible to expect complete trust in our new political thinking, it is impossible to enter a civilized and nonviolent world until it is clearly said: There were not, and there could not have been any circumstances which could have justified a breach of the elementary norms of international law.

Second, the state must give up the chronic habit of opposing ideas and peaceful demonstrations, no matter what they are like, with force of arms. For as long as this danger remains, perestroyka cannot be deemed irreversible.

Third, the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, the invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the "international assistance" to Afghanistan are links in one and the same chain which cannot be separated. Our society's moral health lies in overcoming the imperial syndrome, no matter what form it may take, no matter how fruitful it might appear at times.

The time has come to publicly and clearly admit our responsibility for the "Brezhnev Doctrine." It is dead to all intents and purposes. The only thing left to do is admit this.

Ponomarev Denies Brezhnev Doctrine Existed

PM1310111489 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 First Edition p 3

[Manki Ponomarev article in response to reader's letter, under the rubric "Our International Observer Answers a Reader": "Not Imposing One's Own Will"—first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] KRASNAYA ZVEZDA reader N. Pushkarev asked the editorial office this question in his letter: "I recently read in the newspapers a report on the discussion in the Hungarian parliament of the decision a long time ago to send Hungarian military units to Czechoslovakia. The Hungarian defense minister addressed the parliamentarians. As far as one could see from the brief newspaper account, he said that the 'Brezhnev doctrine' has 'receded into the past forever.' What does this refer to, what is this doctrine?"

[Ponomarev] That concept—the "Brezhnev doctrine"—does not exist, Comrade Pushkarev, in our political vocabulary. As far as I know it was never used in Soviet literature in the past, and is not encountered now. But it is used in the West, quite widely. Sometimes they write: "the Brezhnev doctrine." Sometimes: "the doctrine (or theory) of limited sovereignty." And the term is usually invested with a coloring that is negative to put it mildly, and sometimes patently anti-Soviet.

The first mentions of the "doctrine" go back more than 20 years and are connected, as a rule, with the sending of armed forces from five socialist states into Czechoslovak territory in August 1968. On our part, on the part of the official organs in all the countries whose troops went into the CSSR, this action was represented at the time as a manifestation of socialist internationalism, an act of assistance to the working people of Czechoslovakia in defending their gains and of safeguarding the security of the entire socialist community. Our enemies, however, shouted from the rooftops that this was aggression, the suppression of the Czechoslovak people's desire for freedom, and the forcible imposition of the "Soviet model." Some doubts were also expressed on this score by representatives of certain communist parties in a number of Western countries.

That was when the assertions appeared abroad that the Soviet Union does not acknowledge the right of its Warsaw Pact allies to genuine sovereignty and independence and the choice of their own path of development, but demands their total subordination and unswerving fulfillment of Moscow's directives. All this became known as the "doctrine of limited sovereignty" or the "Brezhnev doctrine."

I will not embark here on a detailed analysis of the events that occurred in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the actions of the five socialist states. Firstly because the right to assess their history belongs to the Czechoslovak people themselves. And also because it seems very easy to judge from a distance of more than 2 decades. Here I see as exemplary the carefully weighed approaches and views recently put forward in IZVESTIYA by such active participants in the events of that time as K.T. Mazurov and Army General I.G. Pavlovskiy.

In general everything was very complex and contradictory at that time. Historians evidently still have to draw up a full picture of what happened and give an appropriate and comprehensive assessment. Today these assessments have not yet taken on a firm shape, and they vary greatly. Thus whereas the Polish Sejm and the Hungarian parliament have now condemned the sending of troops into Czechoslovakia, NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, organ of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, still considers the action to have been necessary, and the only correct action. And the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] Central Committee Presidium has condemned attempts to revise the decisions of the 14th CPCZ Congress, which summed up back in 1971 the results of the sociopolitical crisis that the country experienced in the preceding years and acknowledged as justified the allies' help in overcoming it.

In order to answer your question, Comrade Pushkarev, I think something else is more important. After examining a good many documents from those years—materials from conferences of communist and workers' parties, decisions of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, and statements by Soviet party and state figures—I have found nothing that coincides even remotely with the thesis of "limited sovereignty." Everywhere there is talk of fraternity, solidarity, the bonds of internationalism that bind the socialist community countries, and the need for joint defense of the gains of socailism. It was perhaps only in L.I. Brezhnev's speech at the Fifth Polish United Workers' Party Congress in November 1968 that the idea of the permissibility of military interference in the affairs of allied states was expressed openly. When a threat arises to the cause of socialism in any country, he said, referring to internal processes, "then it is no longer only that country's problem, but the common problem and concern of all the socialist countries," and here "military aid to a fraternal country" is possible.

So official Soviet statements do not seem to have provided any particular grounds for talking about any "doctrine." But you and I know very well now that, while stressing the sovereignty of the allied states and their peoples' right to freedom of choice, we did not shrink from condemning particular decisions by those countries when they diverged from Soviet practice or the dogmatic interpretation of socialism and the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

It took the establishment of the new political thinking, it took the onset of the era of perestroyka and glasnost in our country, for unceremonious interference in the affairs of allied and neighboring states to be abandoned in practice and for everyone's right to a free choice of their path of development to be recognized. The democratization process is proceeding rapidly, although it is developing in different ways in different countries. And that is only natural. This does not prevent increasingly close collaboration among the socialist countries, on the contrary, it only promotes it. The days of ostentatious unanimity are over. Both the domestic and the foreign policy of the various Warsaw Pact states have their own significant peculiarities. But that is no reason to anathematize each other. It is a reason to adopt a thoughtful attitude to the problems being resolved in each country and to the quest for true understanding and collaboration.

The routine conference of the Political Consultative Committee held in Bucharest in July confirmed that new relations are becoming established in the socialist community, based on the principles of complete equality, independence, and autonomy. It is now obvious to everyone that there are no universal models common to everyone, and no one has a monopoly of the truth. Every people determines its own destiny and chooses its own system and structure. No one, on any pretext, can interfere from outside and impose his own ideas about another country's policy. World socialism cannot develop according to a single pattern, at just one pace. That is not natural. The building of a new society is a creative process that is carried out in each country according to its conditions, traditions, and needs.

Full autonomy and full independence, no interference, the comradely exchange of opinions, regular contacts, trust in one another, solidarity—these are henceforth the principles of relations between socialist countries. There is no room here for any other "doctrines." That is obviously what the Hungarian defense minister had in mind when he addressed parliament. It was no accident that in his speech he rejected the very possibility of military intervention against Hungary by any of its allies. Indeed, that is inconceivable now.

Crime Continues To Rise, But at Slower Pace

PM1210154789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[A. Illesh report: "Militia on Crime Situation"]

[Text] N. Demidov held a briefing at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs 10 October. The deputy minister described the crime situation in the country over the 1st 9 months of this year.

This is a list of regions with the highest crime growth rate:

	Percentage growth rate against 1988	
	Total	Serious Crime
Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]	52.2	36.3
Armenian SSR	38.6	51.6
Belorussian SSR	37.0	53.8
Turkmen SSR	35.8	25.3
Gorkiy Oblast	72.7	78.3
Rostov Oblast	70.1	75.4
Kemerovo Oblast	68.4	65.9
Sakhalin Oblast	60.7	44.7
Murmansk Oblast	55.0	74.4
Kaliningrad Oblast	53.8	49.3
Astrakhan Oblast	53.2	63.5
Volgograd Oblast	50.9	73.6
Pskov Oblast	50.8	70.5

The first point that everyone wanted to know was: Has there been any change in the dynamics of the growth in crime since the adoption of a series of emergency measures last August? Judging by the figures supplied by the ministry's Main Information Center, a certain promising trend can be noticed. In all, 1,750,794 crimes were recorded in the country between January and September 1989, which is 437,321 (33.3 percent) more than in the corresponding period of last year. But a comparison between August and September shows a decline in the growth rate of premeditated murder and attempted murder (by 10.5 percent), premeditated grievous bodily harm (by 7.5 percent), and rape (by 1.8 percent).

It seems to us that these figures are noteworthy because, even if you want to present a favorable statistical picture, serious crime statistics are difficult to manipulate—it is very hard for the militia not to record them because the victims are bound to complain and the crime will surface, one way or another. We are saying this because, just a few years ago, even if a reporter managed to obtain some militia statistics, they had to be studied vary carefully because journalists had no faith in the objectivity of the figures supplied to them.

Things have changed now. Nonetheless, even with accurate data in my possession, I would be in no hurry to categorically conclude that a breakthrough has already been achieved in the struggle against crime. In fact, a decline in the growth rate in crime has so far been recorded only for certain categories and over a single month. Something else is promising: There has been a drop in the number of unsolved crimes committed against citizens' life and health. But the mass of unsolved crimes left over from last year is, alas, huge. And it is growing.

Briefing Held on Crimes Against Foreigners

PM0610094989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 6

[S. Lvov report: "Foreign Victims"]

[Text] A briefing was held on 3 October at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs on the subject of combatting crime committed against foreign citizens.

...The gang led by Gadayev, a man with no definite occupation or fixed address, acted insolently and audaciously. The roles were allocated thus: A taxi driver would help a foreign passenger to get in his taxi, while other participants would accompany him in one or two cars, block the road, and threatening the victim with knives, rob him. Between May and September alone the gang carried out 25 attacks in Moscow and Moscow Oblast.

Alas, Gadayev's gang is not alone in "specializing" in foreigners. Over the past 2 months, it was said at the briefing, 4 organized groups were exposed which had committed 37 robberies of foreign visitors. Altogether in the first half of this year, over 2,000 crimes of various sorts connected with foreigners were registered. Approximately 60 percent of them (thefts, robberies, fraud) are committed while buying and selling things. The objects of infringement are most often clothes (44 percent), video, radio, and photographic equipment and tape recorders (26 percent), and currency (15 percent).

According to V. Pankin, chief of the Criminal Investigation Department Main Administration, the overwhelming majority of such crimes are discovered. The

USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has taken charge of this question. There are specialized branches in the structure of the Criminal Investigation Department which employ experienced workers. Special militia groups have been organized in capitals, resorts, and ports, where there are many foreigners. These and other measures have enabled us to stop the growth in "foreign" crime, and patrol and duty service has been strengthened near hotels and airports, as a result of which proceedings have been instituted against 1,847 people for buying currency in small quantities, harassing foreigners, and prostitution.

Statistics show (and guests to our country would do well to know this) that the people who fall victim to crime are most often those who themselves enter into illegal deals with black marketeers, speculators in currency, and prostitutes, and who invite them into their rooms or go with them to their apartments and hideouts.

Visitors also do not always observe our criminal legislation. A total of 194 crimes were committed by foreigners in a state of drunkenness in the first half of this year. Apart from that, around 1 tonne of sturgeon caviar worth a total of almost $350,000 was confiscated from foreigners crossing the border in a year.

Council of Ministers Examines Pensions Bill

LD1310220589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] A draft law on pension provision for USSR citizens which has been prepared in accordance with the decisions of the First Congress of People's Deputies was examined at a session of the USSR Council of Ministers today.

The USSR Council of Ministers recognized that the proposed draft law makes radical changes to the country's pensions system. Some of the most important are the single and universal nature of pensions provision, the social justice and protection of citizens, and the close connection between the size of one's pension and the labor contribution of each worker. Essentially it is a question of a major reform in this sphere. A new mechanism for determining the size of pensions was examined in detail. The distinguishing feature of this is the increased extent to which the pension depends upon length of service and earnings. It is intended that pensions will be increased systematically, and that they will change depending upon the cost of living index. Various approaches were expressed on determining the minimum and maximum pensions. A proposal to the effect that the minimum pension be set at the level of the minimum pay of workers and office staff was supported. Criteria have been defined for setting the maximum sizes of pensions.

Having taken the draft law under examination as a basis, the government instructed the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems in conjunction with the All-Union Central Concil of Trade Unions to do more work on it, taking into account the expressed proposals of the ministries and departments, of the councils of ministers of the union republics, the trade union bodies, and individual citizens. In October of this year the USSR Council of Ministers will submit a draft law to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The session was conducted by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. A report on the session of the USSR Council of Ministers will be published in the press.

Economic Integration in Sverdlovsk, Donetsk

LD1210163289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0900 GMT on 12 October broadcasts a 10-minute report on economic integration in Sverdlovsk and Donetsk.

Marina Tumanova introduces a reportage on economic integration and highlights how production is lost when contractual agreements are not met. She says that over 6 months, 300 light industry enterprises did not fulfill their commitments and in September 300,000 tonnes of foodstuffs did not reach the shops, nor did 33,000 tonnes of industrial goods. She notes that coal is not being delivered according to plan and metal production threatens to grind to a halt.

Nataliya Vartanyan, in an interview recorded on 11 October, links up with correspondents in Sverdlovsk and Donetsk. She first asks the Sverdlovsk correspondent how his area is fulfilling its obligations to the country. He notes that Sverdlovsk is doing its best to fulfil its commitments and takes the example of silage combine harvesters produced on the basis of industry of the Sverdlovsk, Chelyabinsk and Perm Oblasts. Around 7,500 of them are currently produced, but this year it is planned that just 104 of them will remain in the Chelyabinsk Oblast, while three times as many are required. He says that material and technical supply is another problem. He notes the involvement of converted defense industry enterprises in resolving the shortage of consumer goods and cites the example of the Rezh machine works, on the basis of which the production of sewing machines is being developed, and says that the first batch will be manufactured next year, while numbers will rise subsequently to half a million annually. He points out that the shortage of consumer goods is partly due to the lack of microengines, such as those used in domestic appliances and according to him the output of such engines will reach half a million in the 13th 5-year plan. Sverdlovsk oblast has contacts with other republics, including timber processing with Latvia.

Vartanyan then turns to the Donetsk correspondent and asks how the oblast is delivering coal and other products to other regions of the country. The correspondent says that deliveries under contract agreement from the Donbass have worsened over the January-September period and says that the plan of contract deliveries has been fulfilled by just 98 percent. The situation with the delivery of coal is "very, very serious" and he says that for September, 1.1 million tonnes was not delivered by the Donbass to consumers—that is, thermal and power stations of the Ukraine, Moldavia and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, while ferrous metal enterprises receive coking coal. He says that the Donbass is also a victim of the strikes in other regions of the country: "Why aren't the consumers receiving coal now? There are two reasons for this. In the first place, because mines are still working poorly, many of them are not fulfilling plan tasks and in the second place because coal is not being transported. There is a shortage of wagons," the Donetsk correspondent says. Empty wagons are not being supplied to the Donbass from areas where there are railway strikes. He says that in September they did not receive 34,000 wagons for coal transportation. Coal cannot even be delivered to metal workers in the Donbass due to the shortage. Vartanyan says integration must be made more effective, and she stresses Ryzhkov's words that an enterprise which does not meet its commitments will answer to its partner or the state, and its resources may be auctioned.

Government Panel Views Defense Industry Conversion

PM1310123989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In the USSR Council of Ministers. Progress in the Program's Fulfillment"]

[Text] The statewide program, announced in 1987, for supplying processing sectors of the agro-industrial complex with new equipment is gathering strength, but by no means at a pace making it possible to relieve the strain in food supplies as early as next year. That was the overall tenor of the 11 October sitting of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Military-Industrial Questions, which discussed the contribution made by industry's defense sectors toward the development of the agro-industrial complex.

The country created its defense potential over many decades without regard for cost and expense. Soviet people denied themselves a lot, and they are now entitled to expect some return from this sector of the economy, to expect it to help fulfill perestroyka's important social tasks. Sector leaders who spoke at the sitting, reporting on progress in the program's fulfillment in the current year, cited what appeared to be comforting data about the quantity and quality of new equipment for dairy plants, refrigeration facilities, vegetable storage facilities, and bread combines. But, strange to say, all their speeches ended on the same note: If we have failed in some respect, the blame for this lies with partners, suppliers, interdepartmental barriers....

For example, the USSR Ministry of General Machine Building was instructed to develop a major series-produced complex for the manufacture of instant potatoes. Everyone knows that potatoes account for our largest losses at vegetable storage facilities. But hardly anyone knows that only 1.5 percent of the potato harvest is processed in our country, as against 50 percent in the United States. The six plants which the ministry's enterprises pledged to produce by next year should increase the percentage of potatoes processed in our country by a factor of six. One participant in the sitting joked that, since this job is now in the hands of spacecraft control specialists, we should at long last see in our stores the various nourishing "chips" which flood grocery departments in Western supermarkets.

Yes, our space industry is ready to accomplish such a "revolution" on the store shelves. Just as the stewards of former missile shops are perfectly capable of supplying dairy plants with high-class equipment for the manufacture of homogenized milk, developing the series production of mini-bakeries, and setting up a unionwide production line for the manufacture of Russian pasta. But the debate, in which enterprise leaders, chief designers, and party committee secretaries took part as well as members of the state commission, showed that the problems in the defense industry complex' interface with science and practice now lie not in the design and technological sphere, but in that of bureaucratic paperwork. I.S. Belousov, chairman of the state commission and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, emphasized that the defense industry complex is capable of fully and promptly ensuring a sharp improvement in the harvest processing industry. It is merely necessary, he said, to adopt today emergency measures consonant with the tense situation which has developed in the country as regards food supplies.

But the emergency measures listed in the resolution adopted by the sitting will primarily affect thousands of people—engineers and workers—who are already experiencing considerable hardships in the conditions of defense sectors' transition to civilian production, setting up new production lines and mastering new skills. Many of them know what it is like to work nonstop for several days and nights before handing over some important defense order. And now, the state commission members were assured by a representative of the city of Votkinsk, people are prepared to work for the sake of something that is so important for perestroyka. But it is becoming quite difficult to maintain their enthusiasm and encourage their efforts in the conditions created by the recently introduced tax on labor remuneration funds.

In these conditions, participants in the sitting emphasized, special responsibility is borne by party committees in defense industry ministries, enterprises, scientific research institutes, and design bureaus. The real front line of food supplies for our cities and countryside runs through these shops and scientific laboratories.

O.D. Baklanov and Ye.S. Stroyev, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the commission's sitting.

Dialogue Between Party, Informals Urged

PM1310090989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Article by V. Solovyev, Chelyabinsk CPSU City Committee first secretary, under the rubric: "Party Life: The Assets of Perestroyka": "Contacts That Make Sparks Fly"]

[Text] Leaders of unofficial associations came to the city party committee [gorkom] recently to propose cooperation and concrete assistance in the implementation of the program to improve social living conditions in the city, a program which had been adopted at the party gorkom plenum. An unusual situation! A situation which strikes many people as strange. For us it did not come unexpectedly, although the path toward mutual understanding had not been easy.

During the past year more than 10 unofficial organizations came into being in Chelyabinsk and organized themselves into the People's Front of Struggle for Revolutionary Perestroyka. What is this—a temporary flareup of activity or the birth of a new form of political activity, natural in a democratically organized socialist society? Party officials have put this question more than once, both to themselves and to labor collectives and in discussions with the party aktiv. The answers varied: "People feel they have been treated badly, so they grasp the opportunity..." "They shout and organize rallies, what kind of democracy is this! It is not as if they were ready to do something useful..." "What's wrong with people reacting so sharply to social injustice?!" Frankly speaking, there are as many different opinions as there are people.

As is known, perestroyka has awakened the initiative of the masses. This is one of perestroyka's incontrovertible achievements; initiative meaning a broad spectrum of opinions, ideas, and actions. This does not please everyone, and some people are even frightened by it. It has to be admitted: Not we, but the leaders of the unofficial associations first felt the need for businesslike cooperation with the gorkom. But once they had come to us and offered their help, a fruitful discussion ensued about joint work.

I recall my first encouter with the informals on the eve of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. That summer a lot of rallies were held in the city, passions were running high around the so-called "Sidoy affair"—Sidoy was the former chief of the oblast trade administration. After one of these confrontations, I invited the rally participants to continue the debate at the Palace of Culture. It is difficult to put into words what we came to hear from the overexcited, indignant people. Justified claims against Sidoy frequently served as a convenient pretext for accusations to be leveled at the party as a whole and local leaders in general. Obvious distortions. Sometimes one felt like turning round and walking out. However, having pondered the origins of the prevailing psychological situation I came to the conclusion that if one sifted out the emotions and rash conclusions, people were largely right. On the whole, they were identifying the sore points correctly.

To make a long story short, our constructive contacts with the unofficial organizations began with that rather unpleasant discussion. The ground swell of opinion forced us, surmounting the customary stereotypes and caution, to organize a response: a response based not on a negative attitude but on efforts to improve the social atmosphere. No one was suprised when the informals started paying regular visits to the gorkom, to talk to secretaries and apparatus officials. Members of the social justice section, for instance began to establish ties with people's controllers. The ecological section began to function more purposefully. Representatives of the unofficial organizations were given the opportunity to address the Central Rayon report-and-election party conference and present their view of the problems.

So, from day to day, our contacts grew stronger. Members of unofficial associations began to always be present at discussion evenings and lectures organized by the gorkom. In turn, party officials received invitations to rallies, sessions of coordination councils, and other events organized by the unofficial organizations. N. Sheremet, party gorkom instructor (he has now been transfered to the CPSU oblast committee) was elected a member of the "Rodina" historical and patriotic association. S. Rozhentsov, ideological department instructor joined the "Memorial" association, and Gorkom Secretary V. Lipskiy, set up the "Public Opinion" group.

The time came to elaborate the city-wide strategy at the gorkom bureau. As a preliminary, it was decided to invite the leaders of the People's Front and other associations to a meeting with officials of the ideological commission. They entered the bureau hall of sessions with curiosity and a good deal of suspicion. And that is quite understandable. After all, some of them had spoken unflattering words about elective party organs at rallies more than once. In turn, most members of the gorkom were prejudiced against unofficial organizations.

Here are some of the questions that the sides asked each other: "More than one-third of the members of the People's Front are Communists and members of the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol]. Does one not preclude the other?" "To what extent is the People's Front responsible for the extremist actions of some of its members?" "Why is the city soviet executive committee [gorispolkom] so afraid of rallies and people's initiative?"

The words of Yu. Tanzybayev, chairman of the "Rodina" historical and patriotic association, come to mind: "Let us not, along the lines of the experience of the recent past, depict each other as 'the enemy.' We have come together for the purpose of constructive work. We are concerned about the fate of perestroyka and want to make our contribution to its development. So let us strive for real collaboration."

And gradually the ice of distrust melted away. The gorkom has duly evaluated the work of the "Memorial" group which has set itself the task of political rehabilitation of innocent victims of repressions, viewing this as an important means of the democratization of society. Gorkom member B. Usachev, a history teacher, has put a lot of effort into establishing creative contacts between the "Poisk" pedagogical club and public education organs. Many pressing cultural problems are now discussed jointly at gorispolkom commission sessions. T. Kameneva, the drama theater actress was surprised to learn during one of the discussions that literally next to the A.S. Pushkin movie theater there is the "Rakurs" association which screens world and Soviet movie classics. Its leader, D. Yakunin, it appears, was able to organize a meeting with Moscow arts figures and maintains contact with the Taganka Theater. Local actors were unaware of this. The idea of enriching the work of the association by businesslike contacts with the oblast center theater workers was conceived.

Naturally, controversial questions remain, and, as in the past, sparks frequently fly in the course of contacts. And not least of all because a considerable number of unofficial organizations still present their opinion as the only correct and infallible one. And what is worse, individual "fighters for the truth" are trying to foist it on society, cost it what it may, using all but force. Organizing pickets and rallies, disseminating leaflets and resolutions, collecting signatures... It is enough for sober voices to call for restraint, reason, and respect for opponents, and immediately the people who dare to do this are labeled as "opponents of perestroyka," "party apparatchiks," and "bureaucrats." This is hardly compatible with tolerance and decency, or with the self-same socialist pluralism which the informals are advocating with such zeal, as it were. Some of them lack proper standards. This, alas, has to be borne in mind, it requires patient work, and we must try not to succumb to the temptation to emulate the loudmouths and demagogues.

But sometimes, honestly speaking, you cannot but marvel at the manifestations of deliberate one-sidedness. Everyone remembers the tragic catastrophe at the Asha railroad station. It claimed hundreds of lives. Even now it is painful to recall that day when the whole country was shaken by the blind brutality of the raging flames. The stress was enormous. Telephones at city and oblast organizations were literally bursting with questions: What can we do, how can we help? A People's Front rally to discuss the course of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies was scheduled to take place on that day. It would have been only decent to cancel the rally on such a day, but the organizers refused to budge.

Imagine what the oblast and city leaders felt like. Having opened the meeting and described the tragedy, Yu. Aleksandrovich, CPSU obkom secretary, proposed that the debate be postponed. Contrary to common sense, those assembled received this as an attempt to torpedo the political debate and voted for its continuation. Only thanks to the insistent demands of S. Ravcheyev and L. Subbotina, members of the People's Front Coordination Committee, was the rally discontinued. Many of its participants were donating blood for the accident victims shortly afterwards.

People say that you can learn from life. This is true. But nonetheless, the time it is taking to establish some of the unofficial formations has dragged on unjustifiably long. It is necessary to pass on from words to actions. For instance, working conditions at Chelyabinsk industrial enterprises leave much to be desired. This is where the grim exactingness of People's Front groups could come in useful. At the same time we believe that the work must be carried out demandingly, yet without deliberate confrontation with the administration and the trade unions, which frequently is still the case. It would be good to pool efforts with a view to resolving acute production problems.

And trade and consumer services? Everywhere people are short changed, given short weight, there is boorishness, goods are kept under the counter, speculation is rife... The People's Front could take up the struggle against these glaring shortcomings. It would have to be conducted on a strictly legal basis however, without "partisanship," and in cooperation with people's and workers' controllers. Practical experience has shown that the informals, reacting very keenly to hotbeds of social tension, often remain merely militant recorders of the abuses. When the discussion turns to practical efforts, the answer when there is no microphone in sight, is usually one and the same: "You are trying to divert us from politics." It appears that building houses, restoring churches, saving crops which are perishing in the fields, and attending to people's needs is not politics. Does this mean: Let the party and the soviets do the work, while the "platforms" and "speakers" check on them? However, the country is teeming with controllers, and the situation has yet to improve. This is causing concern to many people.

The 28th CPSU Congress is due to take place in exactly a year's time. It will discuss the Central Committee report on the progress of perestroyka and the party's tasks. What will we have to show at this congress? What we need are tangible, positive changes in our life. Ultimately, not just party officials but also the leaders of the unofficial associations will be called to account by the people who still take much of what the latter say on trust, on credit as it were.

I am not claiming that the gorkom is absolutely certain as to what needs to be done in the present conditions. However, the quest for optimum approaches and methods and our constant contacts with the informals show that we have to master the practice of social compromise more swiftly. Unfortunately, certain party leaders and economic managers continue to either adhere to a "hard line" or to complacently shrug off people's entirely justified demands.

To give you an example, I will describe two opposite approaches to the solution of conflict situations. A labor dispute arose at one time at the city's public transport enterprises in connection with the disparity between wages and the considerably increased intensity of labor. At one enterprise, where an objective assessment of the situation was made, it was proposed to set up an independent economic activity analysis group. Having studied the causes of the conflict in detail, the workers found ways to improve the system of labor remuneration and material incentives. In short, an intelligent political approach made it possible to avoid a strike. At another enterprise, on the other hand, rejection of the strike committee's demands and unwillingness to seek constructive solutions resulted in a work stoppage. At this enterprise the party and trade union committees failed to take up a principled stance.

Unquestionably, it is time to grasp that social conflicts are a fact of life. And when complex conditions arise, it is necessary to be able to conduct a constructive dialogue; to find, jointly with the people, mutually acceptable solutions and to soothe passions... It is true that in this context I am frequently being accused of "flirting" with the informals. "What is this, are people allowed to run riot now? Is it cheap popularity you are seeking?" I believe that it is above all the old-style apparatchiks who are paralyzed with unfounded fear. They are afraid of appearing incompetent, tongue-tied, and unable instantly to grasp a situation and defend the party's stance in front of the people.

The time for dialogue has come, for the top and the grassroots, the Communists and the nonparty people, the wrong and the wronged if you like, to meet each other half-way. Therefore we party people are trying to see in the unofficial associations worthy allies in the struggle against bureaucracy, sluggishness, social free-loading, and other vices. The party must regain the trust of the people, therefore it must listen to them more often and trust them more. Here a completely logical question arises: Has the time not come to recognize the unofficial movement as entirely natural and to drop its pejorative title? Many people in our city share this view.

New 'Peace Association' Group Formed

LD1310033889 Moscow TASS in English 2346 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS—A new non-governmental organization—the Peace Association—has been founded in the Soviet Union.

"The idea to set up an organization of this kind arose as a result of the processes of deideologisation of international relations and the growth in activity of public movements," First Deputy Chairperson of the Soviet Peace fund Svetlana Savitskaya told a news conference here on Thursday.

She said that the Peace Association of cooperation between Soviet organizations and organizations in other countries had been founded in line with the decision of the USSR Council of Ministers and is a non-governmental organization.

The organization's founders comprise more than ten Soviet public organizations including the Soviet Peace Fund, the Committee of Soviet Women, the Soviet Committee for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Savitskaya stressed that the activity of the Association will aim at establishing broad international cooperation to realize peacemaking, social and humanitarian projects.

The projects in question include the construction in the Soviet Union of homes for the aged and disabled persons, health rehabilitation centres and new hotels.

The Association will participate in establishing a free enterprise zone in the Vyborg region, in Russia's north-west and provide advisory services to joint ventures and foreign firms and encourage the involvement of foreign currency in the turnover.

Chairman of the Association Board Alexander Kiselyov said that the Association's initial capital amounted to 100 million roubles, 51 million roubles of which were donated by the Soviet Peace Fund.

The Association's turnover, he said, was to reach 80 million to 100 million foreign currency roubles in 1990 and 1991.

Within the same period the Association hoped to make profits amounting to three to five million foreign currency roubles. The sum will help implement the association's peacemaking and social programmes.

Contents of KOMMUNIST Issue No 15 Reviewed

PM1710134089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Journal's Latest Issue"]

[Text] The 15th issue of the journal KOMMUNIST has been published. It opens with materials under the heading "Century of Revolutions." G. Sobolev's article "Letters From 1917" shows the state of mind and real mood of those days. V. Vasilyev's article "Higher Than His Fate" is devoted to J. Nehru—a man who, while valuing highly the experience and role of October in world history, adopted the principle of "nonviolent action" in his struggle for India's liberation. O. Khlevnyuk's review "People of October" examines the two recently reprinted volumes of the Granat encyclopedic dictionary, which brings together biographical and autobiographical material on figures in the Russian revolutionary liberation movement of the late 19th century and the October Revolution.

Under the general rubric "Renewal of Society—Renewal of the Party. Toward the 28th CPSU Congress," readers' views on the problems of democratization of intraparty life are printed. Here too there is A. Leshchevskiy's dispatch "Control Cannot Supplant Interest," from a report meeting held at the Saratov Oblast collective farm named for the 22d CPSU Congress.

A roundup of letters received at the CPSU Central Committee on the eve of the September plenum is published.

The contentious problems of pricing are examined in Ye. Yasin's article "Socialist Market or Fair of Illusions?" The same section includes A. Sizov's sketch "Let Us Check the Figures," touching on questions of food imports, and also a review of an article by the American scientists S. Rozenfeld and R. Fots [names as transliterated] "On the Reform of the Defense Sector."

Reports from the "roundtable" of the journals KOMMUNIST and VOPROSY FILOSOFII are published under the title "Mankind and Civilization on the Threshold of a New Millenium."

Some questions of the development of science are covered in A. Merzhanov's interview, "Inter-Sector Scientific and Technical Complexes—Children of Perestroyka" and in S. Shnol's sketch "Time of Relaxation."

L. Krasutskiy's article "Poland and the Polish United Workers' Party in the Period of Perestroyka" is published. International problems are examined in the items by I. Averin, "Export of Services—Reserves and Problems," and M. Ozerov, "What Public Diplomacy Lacks."

Critical and bibliographical material and information reports are published.

New Weekly To Feature Interethnic Relations

LD0610204689 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 6 Oct 89

[Text] A new weekly, SOYUZ, will appear in Moscow beginning in January next year. As its editorial board has announced, the publication will feature life in Soviet republics, their economy, science, and culture. The magazine will take part in carrying out the Communist Party's ethnic policy to guarantee the free development of all nations of the USSR and strengthen friendship and cooperation between them.

Central Auditing Commission Session Held 21 Sep

PM2709105789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Sep 89 Second Edition p7

[TASS report: "CPSU Central Auditing Commission Session"]

[Text] A session of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission was held on 21 September. Opening the session, A.A. Nizovtseva, deputy chairman of the commission, noted the important significance of the CPSU Central Committee September (1989) Plenum for the life of the party and the country. Communists' main task now is to persistently and consistently implement its decisions. The precongress period now begun requires the mobilization of all party forces to resolve the tasks connected with further deepening restructuring.

The session comprehensively discussed the state of work with letters, statements, and complaints sent by working people to the editorial offices of the newspapers SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and STROITELNAYA GAZETA and the journals PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN and AGITATOR. The participants had been given an advance briefing on the results of checks carried out in the editorial offices concerned. This contributed to a broad, constructive exchange of opinions.

The following addressed the session: I.I. Kostyukov, chairman of the Metallurgical Industry Workers Trade Union Central Committee; V.G. Vladimirov, chief editor of EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA; R.G. Yanovskiy, rector of the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy; A.A. Belyayev, chief editor of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA; N.I. Samilyk, first secretary of the Kirovograd party obkom; G.F. Sukhoruchenkova, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU); and others—12 people in all. They said that, in the conditions of restructuring, people are taking a more active stand and becoming more exacting and intolerant of shortcomings. The increased number of letters from working people to the editorial offices of central party publications is evidence of this. For example, the editorial offices of the journals PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN and AGITATOR and of STROITELNAYA GAZETA are now receiving considerably more letters than before.

It was noted that work with readers' mail holds an important place in the work of newspapers and journals. Editorial collectives use traditional forms: assignments to follow up readers' letters, the publication of letters and responses to them, and surveys. Correspondence is now monitored more closely at every stage. In a number of cases, readers' wishes and opinions expressed in letters become the point of reference in working out topical problems.

While indicating positive changes in editorial offices' activity, speakers also said that there has been no fundamental improvement in work with working people's letters and appeals. Editorial offices still do not interact with readers to any significant extent and fail to reflect public opinion adequately on a number of topical issues in the country's life. Close ties with local party committees have not been established everywhere.

It was noted that letters are not always and not fully used by editorial offices to provide multi-angle coverage of every aspect of the restructuring process and to promptly raise urgent internal party and social problems. At the same time, people expect in-depth discussion on many topical issues and serious analysis with constructive conclusions. This is particularly important now, on the eve of major political events in the life of the party and the country: preparations for the coming 28th CPSU Congress, reports and elections in party organizations, extraordinary sessions of soviets of people's deputies, and elections to local soviets.

It was stressed that it is intolerable for editorial offices to fail to examine letters within the time set and in line with established procedure. There are also considerable shortcomings in organizing the monitoring of letters sent by newspapers and journals for consideration to local and central bodies.

Speakers noted the need to strengthen editorial offices' material and technical base and involve legal experts, sociologists, and psychologists in their work.

A.A. Nizovtseva summed up the results of the discussion. She said that, in the conditions of renewing and democratizing the political and socioeconomic life of Soviet society, the strengthening of party ties with the masses has paramount significance. It is now more necessary than ever to revive the Leninist traditions of work with working people's letters. It is very important for the mass media to use the readers' mail to enhance people's social activeness and develop glasnost. They should publish more spirited letters, thoughts, and statements by readers on restructuring and on the role and responsibility of communists for its implementation in every specific area, in the sphere of ethnic relations, and in party organizations' work with the masses.

The deputy chairman of the Central Auditing Commission also indicated the need to improve analysis and summary work when dealing with readers' mail. The conclusions and generalizations must regularly be conveyed to leading bodies, for which they must serve as a basis for adopting the corresponding political, economic, and other decisions. Informing these bodies, primarily the CPSU Central Committee, of the nature and content of letters sent to party periodicals must be considered one of the most important aspects of newspaper and journal activity.

A great deal has to be done to tighten control over the time taken to examine letters and over the different stages they pass through and to increase exactingness with regard to receiving replies from various organizations.

Constant, unremitting attention to working people's letters and appeals and to the proposals, comments, and requests contained in them is an indispensable condition of ensuring Soviet people's broad participation in the running of the state and deepening socialist society's democratic principles.

The session also heard information on how members of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission have fulfilled their instructions.

Economic

Merits of Leasing Situation Discussed

Ivashko Interviewed

904B0005A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 21 Sep 89 p 2

[Interview with Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, second secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by S. Chudakov, special correspondent for SELSKAYA ZHIZN: "Power of the Land"]

[Text] *More and more people are becoming involved in the discussion about the article by V. Shvets, chief economist of the Sovkhoz imeni Manshuk Mametovoy, Tselinograd Oblast, "Why Are We Delaying Leasing?" (SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 5 August). Today we turn over the rostrum to Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and second secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, who in an interview with our special correspondent touches upon the fundamental question of land use and bringing back the owner on the land.*

[Chudakov] I quote: "While economists agree on questions of payment for the main means of production—machines, equipment, and structures having a specific value and depreciation norms—there is real confusion with respect to land that still does not have a value assessment," writes leaseholder V. Kobelev from Kursk Oblast (SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 2 September 1989). Vladimir Antonovich, you probably have also heard on numerous occasions the apprehensions of specialists and managers of farms: "The leaseholder will pump all the juices from the land and then abandon it. What will you get from it then?" In your view, can this happen?

[Ivashko] Why not? After all, it has happened today with many millions of hectares of land which was also considered ownerless. The state was the owner of the millions now lost forever. The peasant or miner who worked the land were only land users. Now we plan to make them real masters on the land, reserving the right of ownership for the state. That means, if we want to achieve the goal and preserve the land, we first must introduce order into that "confusion," about which leaseholder V. Kobelev writes.

You see, the sense of being a master of the land can be revived only together with responsibility for it. So far that responsibility has been lacking. The land has its own laws and demands on the land user. The land will inevitably take revenge on one who ignores them. The thing is, once it has lost its strength, there is no way to make up for what has been lost. Therefore, I consider the question of preserving the land, the most important part of the ecological system, to be chief both for carrying out present tasks and for the future.

Using the example of the Ukraine, since time immemorial considered the nation's breadbasket, the contradictory nature of the attitudes toward the land is felt particularly sharply. Yes, on the one hand, this is the breadbasket, but on the other, for many decades the republic has been developing as a center of heavy industry. Here they mine coal and ore, and the metallurgical and chemical sectors are heavily developed. Heavy industry accounts for three-fourths of industrial production.

[Chudakov] That is, there is a kind of distortion?

[Ivashko] Sad as it may be. If you fly, for example, over the Krivoy Rog area in a helicopter, a stunning picture unfolds: On the side are the gigantic quarries; on the other are the enormous slurry reservoirs where the waste from processed ore is stored under a water layer; it cannot be discharged into any river or any sea. Therefore, these huge water reservoir-like structures are created, which take up enormous land areas.

However, the country simply would not be able to live without the manganese deposits of the Dnepropetrovsk area. Or, for example, without the Krivoy Rog ore and steel; one-tenth of the nation's total volume is smelted here....

They once mined manganese and iron ore in mines; then, as powerful equipment was developed, they switched to open-cut mining. Of course, it is cheaper, and they get to the ore more quickly. But in so doing, they began taking tens of thousands of hectares of arable land out of agricultural circulation.

Not long ago, a very sharp dispute flared up between the miners and the local kolkhoz farmers. The peasants stood firmly to protect the land. With the increase in mining of the underground treasure by the open-cut method, more and more land treasures are being destroyed. The grain-farming Ukraine in the last 20 years has already lost 2 million hectares of the most fertile plowed fields to industrial construction. That is why in the Dnepropetrovsk area the peasants began literally to lie across the roads, blocking the path of earthmovers and other equipment to their fields.

Perhaps it will be possible in time to replace one type of energy with another from non-traditional sources, using the tides, wind, sun, and so forth. But we will not get more land anywhere.

[Chudakov] How much of it have they already destroyed by lowland hydroelectric power plants, which did not provide very much power, but the grain growers have forever lost the soil.

[Ivashko] Now there are quite a few people who are raising the question of reducing the area of the Kremenchug, Kakhovka, and other water reservoirs. But it is not likely that they will be able to recover this land; it is expensive and not likely to provide the same crop yield that it did before.

Why did this happen? It was because the land, considered to belong to all the people, did not have any real owner. No one pays for it. Now, when regional cost accounting is on the agenda, the question arises: Should we not, here in the Ukraine (although this also pertains to other regions, too), take into account in the prices of the metal, oil and other natural resources being extracted the value of the land itself, the waters of small rivers being made salty by mining discharges, and even the value of the Black Sea? After all, God only knows what wastes we are sending into it from the mining industry alone.

This question of who the land belongs to and the payments for it has come up only now, when the approaches to management of it have changed and the path has been taken to diversify the forms of mutual relations between the peasants and the land based on new forms of ownership of means of production.

On the one hand, we see the firm approach of many leaders who are striving to preserve the kolkhoz as a form of collective ownership, a form of collective management. Vagin, Starodubtsev—they are not letting go of the kolkhozes. I think they are doing the right thing. Large, well-developed, highly efficient farms can be reduced to nothing by some farfetched experiments. They have everything organized; everything has been working efficiently for a long time. Visit, say, the Kolkhoz imeni Kreyser "Avrora" in Nikopolskiy Rayon, Dnepropetrovsk Oblast. There they have a high degree of saturation with fixed capital, work in shifts in livestock raising....

[Chudakov] I visited there. This is indeed a well-organized farm that is thoroughly developed.

[Ivashko] Unfortunately, there are not very many like it. The majority of the peasants have lost the feeling of being the owner of the kolkhoz property and the land. Hence, their indifferent attitude towards it's use.

In my opinion, the elimination of so-called unpromising villages contributed to this to a considerable extent. They began to take them up in connection with the enlargement of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. But you see, it was on these small kolkhozes and sovkhozes that a peasant was truly close to the land, to a specific field, to a specific farm. When he lived next to a farm or field, when he was close to it, he knew every defect, he knew the soul of the land. Now these bonds have been violated. The thing is, farming is a reciprocal process. Hence, the desire to revive its lost links, but now on a new basis: Leasing, family contract, and other forms helping to bring back to the farmer the feeling of being the master of the land. But when will the peasant become the master?

Recently, Vasiliy Aleksandrovich Starodubtsev, chairman of a kolkhoz, invited everyone who wished to start farms. About 100 people came. Most of them were city dwellers; but you see, grain farming skills and the special way of life of a peasant took shape over centuries.

This is like the same layer of soil which, having been destroyed in the open-cut method of mining, is simply impossible to recover later. Moreover, the goals of those coming to the countryside vary: Some are attracted by the independence in farming; others by the big wages that seem at hand; and still others have been looking for a place their entire life without finding it. Will they find it on the land, which requires the most difficult labor to work?

Of course, many city dwellers have had their fill of urbanization. If you have a pretty good apartment and a decent job, you live well in the city. But if you suffer in line for housing—what kind of a life is it there! It is possible that he does not need anything better than farming. But he will stay on the land only if there is freedom on it. There cannot be force in peasants' relations with the land.

[Chudakov] In any case, he should see the real concern about the way he lives, that is, about himself and about the land. The prestigiousness of the title "peasant" must be increased. For the present, they only talk about peasants with reproach: They say, the state gives the peasants so much, but gets nothing in return.

[Ivashko] I think that people are wrong who say that the state has gotten nothing in return for its investments in agriculture in the past decades. Let us count how many peasants there were in the countryside just 3 decades ago and how many there are now. The outflow from the rural areas has been tremendous, but the volume of output has even increased. Where did it come from?

There must be an objective apportionment here: How much have we actually spent on unnecessary projects, and how much went for compensating peasants who left the rural areas and for the rise in prices of material and technical resources? Then they would not have to run down the peasant and accuse him of supposedly receiving so much and giving nothing in return. Some now have this thoughtless approach to the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. They say, it can only be detrimental to the land! Let's close it, they demand, and life in the rural a reas will immediately improve.

But here in the Ukraine, at a minimum, 500 villages do not have water. No one knows how many others have water that is undrinkable. Without irrigation in the Ukraine we also will not be able to grow vegetables. That is why we have had and always will have waterworks construction. We just need to change the approach to using the capital investments allotted for land reclamation and other water management work. We should not abandon them, not decrease them, but separate the money from the contractor who receives it together with the state order. The customers should pay him, that is, the kolkhoz, sovkhoz, and leaseholder. Really, should the same owner determine the type of work and settle accounts for it with himself? But that is the way we did it. We must give this money to the peasant. He himself will determine what is more profitable: clean up a small overgrown stream or lay a pipeline. He will determine what he needs right away and what will wait. Here we approach a very critical problem, which was heard both at the congress of kolkhoz farmers and in the peasants' Appeal to the Congress of People's Deputies: Repay debts to the rural area!

[Chudakov] For the 13th Five-Year Plan R345 billion have been allocated....

[Ivashko] Yes, I know. But the rural area does not need money. I should say, it does not need only money, but money supported by funds for material and technical resources. There is a shortage of them. Despite the assurances about heightening concern for the land, the volume of material and technical resources being allocated to the agroindustrial complex is decreasing. It is not money that the rural area needs today, but cement, metal, fuel, pipes, bricks.... The leaseholder also needs all of this. If he does not have fuel during harvest time, he will go bankrupt. The entire venture will also fail. This is also one of the reasons why the peasant is moving slowly.

I cited the following figures at the Soviet of Elders of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Last year alone, in the Ukraine our agricultural product yield was R2 billion short just for one reason—delays in delivery of fuel. At the same time, the country is selling liquid fuel abroad. The time has come to consider where we are making purchases, what we are purchasing, and how much we are losing in doing so. If the agricultural products lost in the Ukraine would have been processed, the country would have received not 2 but 10 billion rubles. This is just what we could have saved on fuel, but how many other gaps are there through which the peasants' money is leaking, money that is needed for regenerating the land and its strength, for social transformation of the rural area!

[Chudakov] Some economists believe that the rural area's contribution to social development is not as important as a fundamental change in economic relations in the rural area. They believe that is where we should begin.

[Ivashko] But why put one against the other?! New economic relations in the rural area and development of social and cultural life are not contradictory. On the contrary, they are inseparably interlinked. You see, if farming, for example, were to begin to develop rapidly today, the farmer still cannot and will not live without water, gas, roads, and telephones. Another issue: For there to be a return from the funds allocated for social development of the rural area, the peasant himself should decide how to use the money, where to invest it first, and how much. He will find the answers to these questions in the land itself.

We all must understand this as quickly as possible. This is the key to restructuring our relations with the land.

[Chudakov] Obviously, it is not enough to understand. There has already been enough time for that. After all, a century ago the greatest expert of peasant life, the writer-democrat Gleb Ivanovich Uspenskiy, wrote that the land wields power over the mind and conscience of the peasant and fills his entire existence. It will him and all the people, as long as they heed its commands, as long as "at the root of their existence lies the impossibility of disobeying its commands." That is probably why, at the beginning of the interview, you, too, noted that the land will inevitably take revenge on those who do not listen to it. So, our law, human law, must agree strictly with the laws of the land.

[Ivashko] Yes, such a law is being prepared. The law on land and land usage will have to take into account the requirements of true pluralism of forms of ownership and management stated by agrarian deputies. That is, the land will have a master who will truly be concerned about it.

Readers Offer Opinions

904B0005B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 27 Sep 89 p 2

[Article by M. Seslavin, candidate of historical sciences and SELSKAYA ZHIZN editor for the Letters Department, under the rubric "Discussion Rostrum": "Pro and Con: Why Many of Our Readers Do Not Believe in Leasing"]

[Text] *The word "leasing" is on everyone's lips today. The mail each day contains readers' opinions about the development of lease relations in the rural area. But it is hard to recall another economic concept that evoked such conflicting comments and assessments—commendable and perplexed, inviting and frankly unacceptable.*

The discussion rostrum, which the newspaper opened with the article by V.V. Shvets, chief economist of the Sovkhoz imeni Manshuk Mametovoy, "Why Are We Delaying Leasing?" (SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 5 August 1989), brought about a new surge of comments on this topic. In their articles and letters, readers expand the framework of the discussion, touch upon the most varied aspects of the new forms of economic relations in the rural areas, ardently speak out both for and against leasing, and talk about the obstacles being put in its way in the localities. This survey of readers' letters examines the most common—of a historical, economic, and social context—arguments that are being advanced today against leasing.

I would like to begin this survey on a bright note! But I did not encounter a single letter in which the author reported, without reservation: "It is good that I became a leaseholder!" Much more often, unfortunately, they read differently: "They do not give leasing a chance." "They do not allow us to be the boss." "They are putting pressure on us as only they can—they deceive us, shortchange us, humiliate us...." And as a final refrain: "Now you can't get us into leasing for love or money...."

A paradoxical situation is taking shape. The development of lease relations, unequivocally approved and supported "from above," is arousing disbelief, animosity, and even active resistance in the localities. Why?

Let us examine the most common arguments of opponents of leasing. One of them, as we heard from the speaker's rostrum of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, even asked M.S. Gorbachev: "Who slipped you this idea of leasing, Mikhail Sergeyevich?" Similar themes were also noted in the letters to the editor.

"I fully agree with the opinion of the Chairman of the Commission for the Agroindustrial Complex of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, Valter Udam, who cautions against an excessive increase in leasing—a farmstead form of managing agriculture, A.F. Loginov the Orenburg village of Novo-Nikolskoye diplomatically outlines his position. He cites the following historical argument: Leasing was introduced in Russia by Minister Stolypin. First of all, it pursued the goal of dividing the peasants; secondly, it then was based on 'horse' peasants.... Now, with the availability of highly efficient equipment, it is uneconomical to divide large farms into farmsteads."

But why is it absolutely necessary to divide them? Individual farms, naturally, are emerging in places where the large ones—kolkhozes (collective farms) and sovkhozes (state farms)—are no longer able to farm the land profitably, where it is vacant. The farmstead farmer, by the logic of things, fills this vacuum.

A question immediately comes up, a question that is often heard today at the most varied levels: Is the leaseholder capable of feeding the country?

"Will it not turn out that the leaseholders will produce products only for themselves?" Ye.I. Lutkov from Podtelkovskiy Rayon, Volgograd Oblast, expresses his doubt.

What does our domestic and foreign experience indicate? Leasers—individual farmers and even cooperatives—cannot live fully, develop, and use modern technology; in short, they will go bankrupt if they produce "only for themselves," if they do not try to go beyond the framework of a subsistence economy and become producers of a highly marketable surplus. Their own profit and the entire logic of rational economic management will inevitably encourage cooperation and uniting of forces and resources—either within the framework of the established kolkhoz-sovkhoz system, or they will strive to create their own independent, more efficient, and democratic cooperation—production, supply, and sales. Leasers—farmers and cooperators—will become an organic element of a system of civilized cooperators. By the way, even during Stolypin's times, the individual peasant did not withdraw into his own shell, but strove for cooperation. This was so even before Stolypin, as indicated by the splendid letters "From the Village" of A. Engelgardt.

"Does each leaseholder have state thinking?" S.S. Kryukov, a teacher from the Penza village of Olenevka, summarizes the opinion of the skeptics. "Won't this kind of economic management result in the leaseholder raising those crops which provide the most income for personal profit?"

This argument is especially in vogue today with proponents of the current apportionment of plans and orders, and dictating of purchasing prices. You see, by logic, that which a rayon, oblast, and the entire country needs should also be profitable for the leaseholder. No one forces anything upon him, no one directs anything. They only make arrangements on the mix of products to be produced and on prices for them. They only help him, and to the extent that he requests help. The fact that the leaseholder pursues his own profit—what is wrong with that? Otherwise, where will he get the funds to do business better, improve his life, and pay back credits to the state? Should he count on free state subsidies and redemption of loans? But this means to make cost accounting go awry, intentionally or unintentionally to degrade the peasant, and to portray him in everyone's eyes as such a social dependent whom the entire country supports. But that was in the past. We reject that. It is important only to combine and not contrast the interests of the leaseholder and the kolkhoz, sovkhoz, and the country, finally.

It is leasing that makes it possible to combine most fully the interests of the citizens, labor collectives, and society as a whole. Its goal is to restore the owner on the land. An owner who fully acquires the right to free, effective labor, the right to dispose of the fruits of his labor, and, therefore, is vitally interested in the steady improvement of his work. Returning this right to the rural inhabitant, regardless of where he works—on a sovkhoz or kolkhoz, on lease contract, or at his own place—today is the primary and determining cause. Everything else—both the excruciating wait for the counters to be filled with food commodities and the personal prosperity of the villager himself—directly depends on realization of this right and is determined by it. The forced system of economic management, which turned the peasant into a day laborer, as the experience of decades convinces us, was unable to increase sharply the efficiency of agriculture. Today, the productivity of our agricultural labor is 10 times below that in the United States. We lag even farther behind such countries of Europe as Belgium and Holland in this indicator. Our current policy is clear—switch to leasing to the maximum extent possible and grant the peasant complete economic independence.

Another argument against leasing: "The management of kolkhozes and sovkhozes is afraid to give leasing a chance, because this runs counter to our land legislation, which states directly that the land is not to be leased and that this is a criminally punishable act, for the kolkhoz or sovkhoz itself is the leaseholder," concludes G.M. Medvedev, from the Rostov Farm of Verkholomovo.

This, too, is an argument from the past. As was stated at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the development of lease relations will be backed up by legislation. Yu.N. Boriskin, a resident of Maritime Kray and an electrical engineer by profession, comes to a quite pessimistic conclusion. "In Maritime Kray, as in the kray agroindustrial complex and in the localities," he reports, "no one needs workmen for leasing and family contract. I state this responsibly, since 3 years ago I tried to break through this wall, in vain. In words from the high speaker's rostrum, everyone is 'in favor' of this, but in deed.... This year, one director, by the way a propagandist of the party raykom advocating progressive methods of running the farm, told me frankly: 'We will not allow the revival of the kulaks. I consider the party's decision on leasing to be erroneous and do not plan to implement it....'"

Behind these "historical," "constitutional," "class," and "economic" objections, as the letters from the readers convince, one can see the old stereotypes of thinking, and the main thing—a fear of a competitor, a fear of a graphic comparability of today's results with those which the labor of a free and concerned person can give.

If everyone would desire to work in this way, where would all the management personnel go? Look at how many managers there are now over the kolkhoz or sovkhoz machine operator. If you do not believe it, let us count them together. The link manager, the brigade leader, the accountant, the agronomist of the division and sector, the chief agronomist, the deputy director, and, finally, the director himself. There are more—accountants, bookkeepers, economists. The farm has its own pyramid of senior officials from the rayon and oblast.

"Now the peasant is completely deprived of rights; anyone who is even a hairbreath above him can treat him badly," V.A. Potanin from the Novgorod village of Novo-Sitenka summarizes.

How can the peasant be the master? Under such conditions it is possible to be only an obedient performer, submissively uttering: "The authorities know best!" And suddenly he becomes a leaseholder and acquires freedom of actions. Is such a thing conceivable?

Readers note that the leasing concept threatens many—the Ministry of Water Resources Construction, the agroindustrial complex, the Agricultural Equipment Association, the Agricultural Chemical Association, the meatpacking plant, the grain elevator. The leaseholder is willing to pay them only for business advice and real assistance, but not for directives and instructions.

The most dangerous bureaucrat, the recognized kolkhoz leader V.A. Starodubtsev testified at the USSR Congress of People's deputies, has become firmly established in the farms. The golden flow of subsidies has made it possible to swell the staffs regardless of income. We would add: The imperious desire to assume all and any functions of controlling not only production but also the life of the rural person. The all-powerful office, which became accustomed to ruling over and being in charge of everything and which ensured itself considerable and guaranteed wages, sees leasing as its mortal enemy. It will furiously oppose it and take pains to prove that the leaseholder will not feed the country, but, worse than that, is likely to be our class enemy.

But if the managers consent to leasing (after all, you cannot go against time), it would be to leasing that would not break loose from their embrace and would always and in everything operate at their command. You see, then they are "in the business"—they authorize and forbid, plan and allocate, consider and control, give incentives and punish.

Furthermore, they more and more willingly allude to the opinion of the "collective." Yes, today voices against leasing often belong to the rank and file. Not only are those who are close to management indignant, but also those who have gotten out of the habit of working at full strength and make their money as a day laborer. For the lazy person, the indefatigable leaseholder is quite like a thorn in the side—they say he is a self-seeker and scrounger, and will just rake it in for himself. Here the slacker closes ranks directly with the office. Envy of someone else's income is often passed off as noble indignation against self-seeking and social injustice.

How is this all taking shape in practice? The next survey of readers' letters will talk about that.

Goods Shortages, High Prices Discussed

PM1710155689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Ya. Orlov, professor at the Moscow Commercial Institute: "Conspiracy Against the Purchaser: What Is Happening on the Commodity Market Today"]

[Text] In the stores, the list of shortage goods is increasing day by day. More and more often one hears people say: "Where has everything gone?"

For purchasers, this does not fit in at all with the statistics or the reports from trade and industry on the fulfillment of plans. Indeed, for the first time in the last 6 years the trade turnover plan has been fulfilled and even overfulfilled. The growth in trade turnover last year was 2.5 times the corresponding indicators for the first 2 years of the 5-year plan put together. The picture is the same this year.

So how do you explain the situation in the stores, where the shelves are completely bare? After all, there has been a truly enormous increase in trade turnover—R25 billion last year alone! In the stores we see not only the goods, but also their prices, and these are growing unrestrainedly.

There is much talk of economic levers for influencing production, but these levers are only operating at half strength. The authority of the contract has not increased, but fallen immeasurably: The dictatorship of the producer is quite blatant, and trade (the purchaser) is virtually defenseless.

Here are a few pictures drawn, so to speak, from the life. Ordinary goods like "Vanilnyye," "Dorozhnyye," and other cakes have disappeared from the stores. Out of more than 10 brands of caramels, confectionery factories graciously agree to produce 2 or 3. The picture is the same on the market for other goods. An Altay plant that used to produce 20 brands of household articles that purchasers need now offers only one—a new lock. Small, but it costs R25.

Many enterprises, taking advantage of the rights granted to them, try—and they find it easy—to improve their financial indicators by increasing prices and taking cheap products out of production, in conditions where there are shortages and they have a monopoly on the market. They do not give a thought to reducing prime cost or making efficient use of resources. Thus shortages are created artificially for many goods, and a situation arises in which it is much easier for the producer to sell output that is not very varied and is of poor quality. Trade organizations, in turn, also not infrequently find it in their interest to increase prices and step up sales of costly goods; and therefore they do not oppose the narrowing of the range of goods produced and the raising of prices for products.

Many factories and plants, taking advantage of their monopoly position and the lack of competition, as well as the economic autonomy granted to them by law, do everything to avoid concluding contracts with the trade network. As a result the negative factors that distort the tasks and objectives of the reform are exacerbated.

The volume of output, at retail prices, at enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Light Industry increased by R4.3 billion, or 8 percent, in January-September 1988 compared with the same period in the previous year. In that period the production of highly fashionable articles sold at contract prices increased 140 percent, and that of improved quality goods with the "N" index, which sell with a supplement on the retail price, increased by 26 percent. But the production of other goods in mass demand fell by 6 percent (R2 billion).

In order to step up the responsibility of enterprises for accepting and fulfilling the state order and counteract the tendency for cheap goods to be removed from production, it would be expedient, in our view, to establish the following rule. In the event of the conclusion of contracts for delivery in volumes smaller than those stipulated by the state order, or in the event of its nonfulfillment, an enterprise should pay a fine to the state budget amounting to a few percent of its profit for each percentage of the state order that was not accepted or not fulfilled. The enterprise leaders, whose responsibility is particularly great in this respect, should be entirely deprived of bonuses.

It is not difficult today to make a profit, an economically accountable income. A clothing factory autonomously defines the volume of production by formulating its plans on the basis of contracts with the wholesale base.

Fine, apparently. But the size of the deal is almost always smaller than the volume assigned to the enterprise in the management and planning organs' calculations. The "gap" is measured in billions of rubles, which are incorporated in the trade turnover plan.

The market is becoming more costly—and that is an objective result of defects in the economic mechanism. To some extent this practice "fits in" and receives support from the trade system in the trade turnover indicator, 100 percent of which is declared to be the state order. In practice, however, resources are provided for only three-fourths of the target, so trade is simply forced to seek ways of closing the gap in commodities available for trade turnover not with real articles, but with rubles. The more costly the product, the more advantageous it is, not only for the producer, but for trade too. Thus a conspiracy against the purchaser has developed at the heart of the economic mechanism.

The manufacturer is storming a fortress whose name is profit. It should come as no surprise that the 5-year plan for profit was fulfilled early, for instance, by light industry—3 years early. This leap was achieved mainly by eroding the cheap product range, manipulating the structure of output, allowing a deterioration in the quality of goods, and increasing wholesale and retail prices.

It is also important to overcome the trade system's appetite for high prices. To this end it is necessary to increase its responsibility for setting a valid level of contract prices for goods, according to their quality and the population's demand. How? Losses arising from reductions in prices for goods sold at contract prices on the basis of declining demand for them should be written off entirely against the discount budget. At the same time the size of the trade discounts offered on these goods should be increased drastically—by at least half.

Factory and store collectives must be given incentives not to increase gross output on the basis of rising prices, but to increase the production and sale of goods in mass demand in physical terms. In the transitional period that the reform is in today, the methods of centralized planning influence on the market can and must be used. In this respect the state order is essential, despite the general criticism of it. The state order's share of light industry should not be reduced in the initial period, it should even be increased somewhat, especially for goods of social importance.

There is also reason to change the approach to production planning and the evaluation of enterprises' economic activity. As a possible evaluation indicator, the main indicators for the formation of funds—the production development fund, the labor remuneration fund—should be made dependent on the trade order placed. Furthermore it is expedient to introduce the following indicator for the whole planned product mix of the state order for the production of goods: "Deliveries for sale to the population." As for curbing price rises, overfulfillment of the plan for production of goods with the "N" index should not count toward the plan for contract deliveries.

The economic egotism of both the producer and the trader and their desire to produce and sell only goods at a higher price should be resolutely eradicated. Gross output indicators are contraindicated both for the factory and for the store. They are necessary only with a view to justifying the volume of the state order and ensuring a close link between the supply of goods and the population's purchasing power.

For the store, trading organization, trust, or association, there is no need (and no real opportunity) to balance the state order with purchasing power. The main concern for any trade outlet is to serve the purchaser well, to a high standard; incidentally, the fulfillment of the trade turnover plan depends on this too. The idea of stores without a cast-iron trade turnover plan is becoming increasingly popular. The principle is simple: The more you sell and the better you serve people, the more you earn. It is useful to go even further by including in the orbit of this practice not only small trade outlets, but also enterprises operating on an economic accountability contract.

Power Outages Call Quality Control Into Question

PM1310191589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Yu. Rogozhin article including interview with V. Sidorenko, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry Report on Incidents in the Nuclear Power Industry: "Nuclear Electric Power Stations [AES] in September: USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry Report on Incidents in the Nuclear Power Industry"]

[Text] On 14 August the new unit at the Zaporozhskaya AES, unit 5, was connected to the power network, which means that there are now 45 nuclear power units operating in the country.

In September there were 11 unscheduled reductions in generating capacity and 15 unscheduled outages, including those at the following power stations:

Nuclear station	Total Outages	A	B	C
Yuzhno Ukrainskaya	5	0	3	2
Balakovskaya	3	1	2	0
Zaporozhskaya	3	0	2	1
Khmelnitskaya	2	0	1	1
Beloyarskaya	1	1	0	0
Rovenskaya	1	0	0	1
Total	15	2	8	5

A: outages due to equipment failure;
B: outages for which staff are to blame;
C: outages for which planning and other organizations are to blame.

The radiation situation at all AES's and in the monitoring zones did not exceed the normal operating limits.

V. Sidorenko, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry Report on Incidents in the Nuclear Power Industry, now answers IZVESTIYA's questions.

[Rogozhin] Viktor Alekseyevich, in their responses to our previous publications on the work of AES's, readers note: From the number of unscheduled losses of capacity and outages it is hard to judge the degree of risk that specific AES's present to the environment and the population. What can you tell us on that question?

[Sidorenko] When preparing today's summary we studied readers' suggestions and are trying to find out the causes of the outages at each AES. However, this does not solve the problem of improving the methods of informing the population about the work of nuclear power stations. After all, the population doesn't need the technical details of incidents at AES's. People, as a rule, are interested in what is most important: How far will an incident affect the population's health and the environment?

For all intents and purposes this problem is an old one and is connected with the provision of information to the population on natural disasters. It was resolved by the introduction of the widely known scales for quantitative measurement of the force of the elements: A 12-point scale for wind force and a 9-point scale for earthquakes. By analogy with those scales a number of countries (France, Japan) have developed scales showing the severity of incidents at nuclear power stations. Soviet specialists are now involved in the elaboration of an international scale under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency. As soon as it is ratified we will inform the paper's readers.

[Rogozhin] Let us return to today's summary. It notes that a new power unit has been commissioned at the Zaporozhskaya AES. Were there any problems in starting up the unit and bringing it up to design capacity?

[Sidorenko] There are bound to be problems when commissioning a facility as complex as a nuclear power unit. Our inspectors at the Zaporozhskaya AES were forced to delay the commissioning of the no. 5 unit by almost 2 months and demanded performance certificates for certain systems which ensure safety.

[Rogozhin] Could you tell us which nuclear power stations are going to commission power units in the near future? What problems does your committee have to tackle at AES's under construction?

[Sidorenko] In September the 3d unit at the Yuzhno-Ukrainskaya AES began generating electricity, and work is now in hand to bring the unit up to its capacity under the electricity generation program. At the end of October a commission from our committee will begin work at the Rostov AES. Its job is to grant permission for the commissioning and debugging work to begin at the no. 1 unit.

As for problems at AES's under construction, the prime ones are the late delivery of equipment and also the supply of incomplete and substandard sets of equipment; the hidden defects of construction and installation work which are constantly coming to light during commissioning and debugging work; and the insufficient amount of full-scale testing of the prototypes of main equipment at the manufacturing plants. Here, too, I agree, our specialists have plenty of work to do....

There is something else I would like to say. We are extremely alarmed at the fact that some plants manufacturing equipment for the nuclear power industry (and there is no need to convince people how high the quality of that equipment should be today) have misinterpreted the thrift policy. Unfortunately, the same thing also happens in construction and installation organizations. I am talking about the cutback (planned and already being implemented) in quality control services. Such hasty and ill-considered steps should not be taken on any account! Quality, reliability and, consequently, to a large extent also the guarantee of safety are the indispensable conditions in the nuclear power industry.

Scientific

'Cosmos-2048' Satellite Launched 17 Oct

LD1810100189 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT 18 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 18 TASS—A "Cosmos-2048" sputnik was launched in the Soviet Union on Tuesday by a "Soyuz" carrier-rocket.

It carries scientific instrumentation for further studies of outer space.

The sputnik's initial period of revolution is 89.4 minutes, maximum distance from the Earth's surface (in the apogee)—270 kilometers, minimum distance from the Earth's surface (in the perigee)—248 kilometers, orbital inclination—62.8 degrees.

In addition to scientific instrumentation, the sputnik is fitted out with a radio system for measuring elements of the orbit, a radio-telemetric system for transmitting information to the ground on the work of equipment and scientific instruments.

All equiment is functioning normally.

The coordination and computing centre has started to process incoming information.

'Mir' Cosmonauts Finish 6th Week of Experiments

Carry Out Maintenance

LD1710121489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Our cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov are concluding their 6th week of orbital flight. Today, the crew will carry out a number of planned monthly maintenance jobs on the onboard systems and equipment of the station. According to the medical monitoring schedule, both cosmonauts will undergo another check. A medical experiment—Sport—is also planned. It is carried out with a view to determining the optimal regimes for the physical training sessions of the cosmonauts during extended weightlessness.

The flight of the Mir scientific research complex is going according to program. The cosmonauts are healthy and feel well.

Continue Research

LD1710134689 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 17 October 89

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—TASS correspondents report from the Flight Control Centre:

The Soviet cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov are continuing planned experiments on board the "Mir" research complex.

Different areas of the Soviet Union were filmed again in accordance with the programme to investigate the Earth's natural resources and the environment.

Today the crew will examine the basic equipment and onboard systems.

The astrophysical research programme provides for the next series of experiments. Studies of high energy charged particle streams and their propagation in near-earth space will be done with the help of the "Maria" magnetic spectrometer.

The vehicle's commander and engineer will have their cardio-vascular system and eyesight checked.

The piloted complex's orbit was corrected before noon with the help of the "Progress M" cargo vehicle's propelling plant.

Reports from the orbit show that the flight is proceeding according to schedule. Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov feel well.

Microcircuit Failure Delays Module's Launch

PM1710141589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 2

[S. Leskov article under the "Fact and Commentary" rubric: "Launched Delayed 40 Days"]

[Text] Flight control center has announced that the launch of the supply module (module D) for the Mir orbiting station planned for 16 October has been delayed again.

One month ago journalists were invited for the first time to the recently declassified Khrunichev Machine Building Plant which, among other things, makes modules for the orbiting complex. What of it, you will say, it is a good plant which produces unique equipment. It is just that there is always something happening with these space modules. It is hard to calculate just how many times a routine launch has been postponed. Of the five modules planned to dock with 'Mir' at the current moment only one has been launched—the astrophysics module Kvant. As a result, the 'Mir' complex, which was conceived as a docking station for a number of modules designed to carry out various pieces of scientific and technological research in orbit, has been dubbed the "cosmic construction schedule overrun."

So during the visit to the Khrunichev Plant journalists began by asking A. Dunayev, chief of the USSR Main Administration for the Creation and Utilization of Space Technology, and A. Kiselev, director of the enterprise, what was the reason for the endless delays and will there be more? The explanation was given that this is complex output but that now our launches are starting right on schedule. It must be admitted that few received this with confidence....

Of course, launching an imperfect space craft on a stipulated day simply because that day was chosen in advance is no solution. It is better to delay and send a reliable craft into orbit. But the point is that these postponements have their impact on the complex space program with many interlinked stages. Crews and launch complexes carry out preparations all for nothing and the scientific program becomes compressed. Most important of all, the operational life of the orbiting central unit of the complex in question—the 'Mir' station—is getting close to the limit. For several years now it has been working below capacity and there is no guarantee that at the present rate of module preparation the complex will ever assume its planned form.

What prevented the supply module launch this time? The fly in the ointment was the Voronezh "Elektronika" Production Association, which supplies microcircuits for the 'Kurs' approach and docking system. During the earth testing of other space facilities last month they malfunctioned seriously four times. By the way, the "Elektronika" Production Association produces microcircuits for Soviet video recorders, too—their quality needs no commentary.

There are a great many questions that one could put to the space module creators. Why was the consignment of microcircuits produced in 1985 according to an outdated technique not replaced promptly by a more up-to-date batch at the right time? Couldn't the unreliability of the microcircuits have been detected sooner and not just one week before the launch? An answer can be given to each question, but the fact remains that the U.S. microcircuits on board Voyager have been working uninterruptedly for 12 years now while ours break down even before the launch.

It is indicative that the leaders of the "Elektronika" Production Association are quite satisfied with the quality of their output. They gave an assurance that despite the malfunctions the microcircuits are reliable and there is absolutely no reason to delay the launch. But as flight leader V. Solovyev noted, a space craft needs to be more reliable than a video recorder. Incidentally, a new batch has been made in Voronezh. The economic mechanism of cooperation among the sector's enterprises gives no guarantee at the moment that the replacement microcircuits will be of high quality.

So the replacement of the microcircuits will take a month and the module D launch date has been put back to 28 November. The docking with the orbital complex is set for 4 December. In an extremely tight schedule cosmonauts Viktorenko and Serebrov will have to go out into open space five times in January and early February to test, among other things, a space "motorcycle" brought by module D. But working with the next module, the technological module (module T), as this crew dreamed of doing and, furthermore, was preparing for so keenly, will no longer happen. On 19 February 'Vityazya' will have to return to earth. The launch of module T, it emerges, has also been postponed—to some time next spring.

Weightlessness Studied on Biological Satellite

LD1710162189 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 17 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS—By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova and Andrey Surzhanskiy.

Research done at the Cosmos-2044 Soviet biological satellite will help reduce the adaptation time of crews during space flights, a leading Soviet space biologist told reporters here today.

Experiments carried out on board the craft under the international Bion programme will help crews stay fit in the first days of weightlessness, Yevgeniy Ilyin, second-in-command at the Soviet Institute of Medico-Biological Problems, said.

Increased stays in space require new ways of combatting the adverse effects of weightlessness on man, he said.

Reporters were shown a video film of Zhakonya and Zabiyaka, two macaque-monekeys who spent a couple of weeks looking down on our planet.

They are doing fine, scientists say.

"It even did them some good," they said.

The monkeys are completing the period of adaptation to earth conditions.

The craft also carried insects, fish and plants.

The experiment lasted from September 15 to 29. Scientists from some 20 countries including states taking part in the Intercosmos programme, the United States, France, Canada and the European Space Agency participated.

Research is continuing both in the Moscow Institute of Medico-Biological Problems and in laboratories of the countries involved in the Bion programme.

Military

Details of Kirovabad Airport Runway Collision

PM1710135189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 89 p 1

[Ye. Zhirnov article under the "Reporting the Details" rubric: "On a Different Airstrip"]

[Text] The explosion was immediately followed by a wave of flame spreading across the airfield. It happened at Kirovabad airport on 12 October at 1939, local time.

As your KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent was told by the air force, the schedule for that evening was for a routine training flight by an Su-24 bomber piloted by Colonel Yu. Grigoryev, airman first class, with Captain A. Gorodchukov as navigator. According to the preliminary information, lack of concentration was the pilot's undoing. He had taken off from this airport on numerous occasions but when preparing for takeoff on 12 October he took the plane not to the start of the runway but to the taxiing strip which diverges from the runway at an angle of 6 degrees, which is almost imperceptible even for the instruments.

The second factor which contributed to the disaster was that the the flight controller and his assistant had been diverted from monitoring the takeoff. Some 500 meters later the aircraft wing hit an empty bus standing by the taxiing strip, the navigator had time to eject, and moments later the Su-24 crashed into an AN-12 military transporter which had been refueled.

The material losses were tremendous and people's fathers, brothers, and sons will not be returning to their families.... The explosion destroyed both planes, and five airmen and one fuels and lubricants officer were killed. The casualty list has been increased by the death from injuries and burns of the soldier driving the fuel truck.

The commission headed by Lieutenant General of Aviation Ye. Rusanov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Aviation Flight Safety Service, is still at work, trying to clarify the circumstances and actions taken by the officials. One thing is clear—an airman's work is extraordinarily difficult (suffice it to say that the deceased pilot was supposed to remember and monitor around 2,400 aspects of the plane's condition) and the psychological burden is tremendous. The amounts spent on solving airmen's social and everyday problems are always worth it. Cutting costs here suicidal, because as is well known, it doesn't pay to cut corners.

New Combat Training Policy Explained

AU1310190989 Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 13 Oct 89 p 2

[Article by Colonel Stepan Fedoseyev of NOVOSTI, "specially for NARODNA ARMIYA": "The Guideline is Quality"—first paragraph is editorial addition]

[Text] Senior Lieutenant Yuliyan Kharizanov asks: "What are the new developments in the combat training of the Soviet Army's forces that stem from the defensive military doctrine?"

The Soviet Union's defensive military doctrine is constructed on the principle of reasonable sufficiency of armed forces and armaments. Both this fact and the forthcoming unilateral reduction in the Soviet Armed Forces make it necessary to reorganize troop combat training with the aim of reaching a new, higher standard.

As Soviet Defense Minister Army General Dmitriy Yazov stressed, a complete change is now needed in the people's mentality, toward resolutely combating the ingrained practices of resolving all issues concerning combat readiness on the basis of quantitative factors, instead of qualitative ones. Today the message that Lenin left to us is topical as never before: "Less, but better, is preferable."

From the very beginning of the training year, the Soviet Army adopted a firm policy for achieving the set goal. Within the framework of the Ministry of Defense, meetings of commanders of combined units were organized at which they studied the contents of the new programs and gained a good grasp of the meaning of the quality indexes for modern defensive construction that are applicable to combat training.

Attention was focused on personnel training by land, sea, and air, the foundation of which is tactical training. Thus, at the session of the Land Forces Military Council that analyzed the results of combat and political training, tactics and tactical skills were discussed with great concern. The task was set of reviving tactics as the art of fighting. However, this problem is not, so to say, merely a land-based problem. It also concerns the other branches of the services.

"Tactics began to become fossilized at the beginning of the seventies," said Lieutenant General V. Khazikov, deputy chief of the Main Combat Training Directorate for Ground Forces. "The main criteria for training used to be live firing exercises. The commanders devoted all their energy to hitting the targets. If the targets were hit, one would receive high marks for the exercise. Of course, firing exercises are important and necessary, but they should be combined with skillful tactical operations.

"This training year, a number of measures have been adopted in order to revive the art of tactics. In troop tactical training, efforts are being directed toward exercises with opposing forces, including the use of such methods as a contest between a batallion and different regiments, or even different divisions.

"We will soon be fitting all training and small arms with laser fire-and-hit simulators. The tanks that come under such 'fire' during exercises will stop, light up, and start to smoke, and they will not be able to fire.... The 'dead' soldiers will also be removed from combat. We will thus be able to objectively assess who has acted properly according to the rules of tactics, and who is the better or worse trained."

"The official documents indicate the lines, contents, and final aims of combat training. As for everything else—ways, methods, and means, we will decide them for ourselves," said Colonel V. Maskayev, an air regiment commander. "It is clear that we will achieve no progress merely by straining ourselves to the physical limit. New approaches are needed.

"In our unit we held a competition for ideas and suggestions aimed at reducing aviation equipment training times, in which almost everyone took part. The results are clear to see. About 30 percent of the suggestions received were acknowledged to be useful and were applied. However, the main point is that the utilization of these proposals enabled us to cut the total hours spent on equipment training by 13 percent of the standard time for achieving an excellent rating."

Socialist emulation will decide who has achieved the best results. All the work on developing socialist emulation during this training year is being directly concentrated in the companies, batteries, and equivalent subunits, and is aimed at each individual soldier. Competition is increasingly becoming an integral part of drills, exercises, and training sessions. This process is greatly helped by the renunciation of the formerly accepted practice of "appointing initiators" for competitions, and by publishing their pledges in the press. Certain declared initiators often did not turn out to be leaders.

How much simpler it has proved to compare the achievements of individual soldiers and subunits, and to declare: Here is a true leader, we should measure ourselves against him. This is far more clear and convincing. There are also proposals to organize contests between leaders in the units, combined units, and service branches. It will then become perfectly clear which ones lead the field.

Nuclear Detonation in 1954 Troop Excercise Noted

90UM0003B Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Sep 89 First Edition p 2

[Article by Colonel (Reserve) V. Zmitrenko, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent: "The Explosion, About Which We Can Talk Now"]

[Text] Had I known that the time of perestroyka and glasnost was to ensue, it is very likely that I would have filled up more than one page of my correspondent's notebook on that memorable assignment. Not so much with words and figures, but, out of front-line habit, with conventional symbols over which the devil himself would stumble. But there are none, and I relied on memory: It was not an ordinary event, and it cannot simply be erased from memory. Moreover, I did not want to burden myself with anything that could in the slightest degree harbor a military secret.

I regretted this not very long ago, when I read a letter from the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA mail from Yuriy Konstantinovich Sozonov from the settlement of Tomilino in Moscow Oblast. He writes:

"In August of 1954 a troop exercise was held in which a nuclear weapon was employed.... I would like to find out... how it was prepared, how it went, and what the findings were.... There was a TASS report about it...."

We will begin with two specific points. First, that exercise was not held in August, but in September. Second, It was really on 17 September, within 3 days after an atomic bomb was exploded over the test site, that the press published the TASS report. It said the following:

"In accordance with the plan of scientific research work, a test of one of the types of atomic weapons was conducted in the Soviet Union in the last several days. The purpose of the test was the study of the effect of an atomic explosion. "

"Valuable findings were obtained during the test which will assist Soviet scientists and engineers in successfully resolving tasks concerning protection from an atomic attack."

Thus, nothing is said in the report about the fact that an atomic weapon was employed in a troop exercise. But, obviously, the statement referred to precisely such a test.

Such matters, naturally, were kept secret. Still, the number of persons was not small, mostly officers, who were informed in one or another degree about this large-scale exercise, which was conducted for the first time, and, as far as is known, only once. The turn came also for officer-journalists of RED STAR. When the participants in the exercise, after traveling more than a thousand kilometers, returned to their permanent stations (it seems it was already October), the editorial office received permission to print feature stories on its pages about commanders of regiments that distinguished themselves. These days there is nothing special about such an achievement. But at that time, "to disclose," as we expressed ourselves, a number of unit commanders of various branches of troops, and to indicate their names, ranks, etc., in the newspapers, was something that had to be fought for. Of course, one restriction—and a very important one—was maintained: Not a word about the atomic explosion itself.

On that day, we, Viktor Kononenko and I, correspondents in the department of combat training and education, were called by our chief, Colonel N. Denisov. The instructions were brief: Both of us were to depart immediately on an assignment to the city of "B" and to come back with one feature story each within 5 days. Kononenko was assigned to regimental artillery commander Zherebchuk, and I was assigned to Grigoriy Sergeyevich Aleksandrov, the commander of a rifle regiment.

We talked to dozens of people who had very recently attacked "the enemy" immediately after the nuclear strike, and who still had an impression of what was seen and endured. I wrote the names of seven officers on a page of the correspondent's notebook, not counting Aleksandrov's name, battalion commanders Stankevich and Zgonnik, company commander Captain Belonogov, and officers Krivonosov and Peganov. I can no longer determine with whom and what the discussions were about. But I recall that we were not obtrusive when we asked questions, and we were not offended when we heard very restrained answers in reply. But, nevertheless, we gradually drew a picture which is not known to many to this day (I, for example, read about this test for the first time in the open press as late as 1968. The book "50 Years of the Armed Forces of the USSR," in the section on chronology, reported in small print that in September of 1954 a military exercise was conducted by the Soviet Union with a live explosion of an atomic bomb.)

I will note that in conversations with officers of the regiment we on the whole did not talk about the advisability of such a "measure." A "cold war" was going on in the world then, and the NATO bloc, into which West Germany was being drawn, was being reinforced. Nine years after the war, which took away 20 million fellow-countrymen, it did not even occur to us to question any measures for strengthening the combat capability of the army and the defensive capability of the country. Undoubtedly, there also was a purely military need to work out the actions of troops under conditions of nuclear weapon employment.

The exercise was prepared in good time and with great care. Aleksandrov explained: It is difficult to surprise us, front- line personnel, when it comes to digging trenches and dugouts, but even we were surprised by the scale of earth-moving work in the test area. There were many types of trenches and passageways, in many places with covers. The shelters were deep, with dual doors. Similarly, there were also shelters for combat and other equipment and for ammunition.

Judging by everything, the first concern was for the security and safety of people. Here the matter was not restricted to the durability of the shelters for personnel. People were equipped with individual means of chemical warfare protection and dark glasses for the gas masks. Decontamination stations were deployed in accordance with established procedures, hospitals were in full readiness in an area adjacent to the test site, and also firefighting crews. This is quite normal—unforseen circumstances could occur also. The safety of people was also first in political-educational work, and in lessons on combat readiness.

But before the troops arrived at the camp, the place for conducting the exercise was being selected with nagging care. Low population density was an indispensable requirement here. It was decided on an area located on the territory of the South Ural Military District. (There was such a district. Briefly, after the war there were also other districts, which it is unlikely that a majority of servicemen of the present generation will remember—Tavricheskoye, Baranovichi, and Voronezh....)

As I was able to find out later, a study of the terrain and other preparatory work was begun as early as winter, and it moved into full swing in the spring and summer. Marshal of the Soviet Union G. Zhukov played an important role in this. He, on returning to Moscow after the death of Stalin, then occupied the post of first deputy of the USSR Ministry of Defense. General of the Army I. Petrov, the chief of the Main Directorate of Combat and Physical Training, took an active part in the organization and preparation of the exercise. This distinguished and modest general is less known than other military commanders, although the situation changed somewhat with the publication of Vladimir Karpov's documentary tale "Commander." Participants in the exercise also mentioned Lieutenant General Ye. Zhuravlev who did a lot for the comfort of the troops in the camp. It was pleasant to hear about this: Yevgeniy Petrovich, while commander of an army, presented me with an order in the foothills of the Carpathian Mountains.

Everything was ready by the middle of September. We were just waiting for the wind to blow in the right direction in order to prevent radioactive fallout from settling near populated areas.

Was it frightening for exercise participants? One could gather from their words that it was not the burst itself that was frightening, but the uncertainty. Of all of the destructive factors of a nuclear weapon, radiation was feared more than anything else, i.e., that which was less understood and which was intangible. Naturally, this was taken into account in educational work.

The reader must forgive me for this short digression. I recalled an amusing episode. When I was on the assignment, I told the chief of the political department that I was sent to write a feature story about Aleksandrov, and he objected: They say that Aleksandrov is crude, and that he ignores political work, even though he was a commissar formerly. Not long before the explosion at the test site he lined up the soldiers and declared: If anyone is slow in getting under cover, he will live, but, as a man, life will not be worth 2 cents. This is his idea of a "heart-to-heart" talk. We will select another candidate.

Seeing my embarrassment, the commander of the large unit decided otherwise: Yes, they say, he has shortcomings, but I will put Aleksandrov on the main axis of a strike in the event of a battle. The feature story was written about Aleksandrov (and it was published in the newspaper on 3 November 1954). When afterwards I reminded Grigoriy Sergeyevich of his "illucidating" talk to the soldiers, he seemed to regret what happened, but suddenly, with a sly twinkle in his eyes, he said: "But, you see, not one person in the regiment breached the established procedure...."

The commander of the regiment spoke somewhat grandiloquently about the last minutes before the explosion. He did not restrain himself. He went out of the semi-dark cave of the observation post. He knew that it was unlikely that he would see anyone, but the surrounding silence struck him. The sun was shining, and the leaves of a bush barely moved. Somewhere high in the sky an aircraft with an atomic bomb was coming. Soon, very soon, this bomb would explode right here, over this steppe which stretches from the trenches to the horizon. The regiment with all of its attached and supporting systems, all of which had gone into the ground, hiding, will get up on a signal, and it will deploy and ram and sweep the "enemy" away, more correctly, that which remains of the enemy after the nuclear strike. He and everyone who advanced with him will remember that split second forever....

Those who were preparing for the offensive immediately after the nuclear strike did not see the burst itself, or rather, the brilliant flash, while waiting for the signal in the shelters. But they felt it! Each one had his own individual sensation, but their aggregate impression was summed up in two words: "badly shaken...." Here and there doors opened wide despite strong bars. The thunder that rolled overhead was almost deafening, a crackling could be heard from above, and the noise gradually quieted down. Then, finally, the signal for the attack was given.

The first thing that struck the eyes after being underground was the enormous cloud, covering half the sky, that seemed to be pushed upward by a rumbling red flame from below. It changed in color, and it became crimson and less brilliant, and it swirled, climbing higher, carrying along and sucking up a column of dust and everything else that was there.... Another thing was also startling: The terrain lying in front of us changed beyond recognition. How exactly? Here, those being interviewed were quite unanimous and just as vague: "Well, it is an entirely different landscape...."

Of course, no time was spent on inspecting the terrain, and everyone did what had been planned earlier and learned in numerous drills. Tanks, armored personnel carriers, and prime movers with guns came out from under cover with a roar. The regiment moved forward under armored protection.

Here are some observations of participants in the offensive through the nuclear strike zone.

The ground was level, strewn with pebbles, as if it was ploughed up. Here and there it was melted. It smoked in some places. There was no vegetation or anything else. Bare stubs standing vertically—the remains of trees—could be seen only at ground zero.

All attention was on instruments that were registering the degree of radioactive contamination of the terrain. Then there was something unexpected: The X-ray meter almost did not react to the radiation. The commander of a tank platoon reports with alarm over radio: The instrument is defective. It was the same story with other instruments. It was soon clarified: The bomb exploded somewhere within the bounds of 300 to 400 meters above the ground, and a slight contamination of the terrain occurred (apparently, a higher level was planned for—it is said that god helps those who help themselves).

Several tanks were seen, including heavy tanks, along the way closer to the epicenter of the explosion. Some of them were melted and seemed to be planted in the ground, and others that were hurled from their positions for dozens of meters were lying on their backs with tracks pointed upward. There were simply mounds of earth here and there. It was not possible even to guess what objects were buried by the explosion. Then a charred sheep, which the engieers had pulled out of the ground, was seen in this area. Animals that were positioned not far off, but in a trench, survived.

Well, did any of the people suffer who were not inside shelters? Almost all of those interviewed heard nothing about such cases. Someone, nevertheless, talked about how the flash caught one soldier of the attacking regiment in a trench, and the soldier, as he was taught, instantly dropped face down to the bottom of the deep trench and covered his eyes. He was only sprinkled with earth slightly when the shock wave arrived. Another soldier, if you can believe the stories, was in open terrain at the moment of the explosion, but far from ground center, about 10 kilometers away. He also dropped behind a mound with his head in the direction of the explosion and got off with only a slight scare (and, maybe not slight, but who knows).

The exercise was concluded successfully, and the tasks that were assigned the troops were fully executed. I can cite only this detail.

Shortly before departing the regiment I dropped by Aleksandrov's office. He himself, stooping slightly, was bent over a table with maps, diagrams, and some kind of sheets of paper. I read two words on one of them from the corner of my eye: "Stankevich and flare [raketa]." I asked what this was. It turned out that these two words concealed a specific idea.

During the dash to the nuclear strike zone, the subunit commanded by officer Stankevich diverted to the side. It was only owing to the rocket flare [raketa] that the commander learned where he was located, which then helped Stankevich take up his position in the regiment's order of battle. This happened because there were not only no landmarks on the terrain after the atomic strike, but the terrain itself became unrecognizable. Then I thought about how to avoid such incidents and what to substitute for terrain landmarks that are swept away by an atomic hurricane.

A common occurrence. That is the way we looked at all of this at that time. But, today, that occasion and those people do not seem to me to be entirely common. For they peeked behind a certain barrier and saw with their own eyes what a nuclear explosion is like, and what its consequences can be. While we only read or write about all of this today (and we hope that we will not experience it), a service was rendered by those of our countrymen in uniform who were "badly shaken" on 14 September 1954.

My story will probably seem incomplete to Yuriy Konstantinovich Sozonov, who in his letter to the editor wanted to find out about that memorable test. But, then, others can continue the story.